



UNIVERSITY  
OF PITTSBURGH



Dar. Rm.  
DA531  
1802  
C654  
v. 15

LIBRARIES

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2010 with funding from  
University of Pittsburgh Library System







C O B B E T T ' S  
...  
POLITICAL REGISTER.

---

VOL. XV.

FROM JANUARY TO JUNE

---

1809.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED BY T. C. HANSARD, PETERBOROUGH COURT, FLEET STREET:

PUBLISHED BY RICHARD BAGSHAW, BRYDGES STREET, COVENT-GARDEN;  
SOLD ALSO BY J. BUDD, PALL-MALL; W. AND J. RICHARDSON, ROYAL EXCHANGE;  
BLACK, PARRY, AND KINGSBURY, LEADENHALL STREET; J. MERCER, DUBLIN;  
J. MORGAN, PHILADELPHIA; AND E. SARJEANT, NEW-YORK.

Dar.  
DAS 31  
1802  
C 654  
V. 15  
cop. 1

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

---

## OFFICIAL PAPERS.

*Page*

<b>CONVENTION</b> in Portugal—Report of the Board of Inquiry to the King,	
Dec. 22, 1808 : Also the subsequent Proceedings of the said Board	12, 47
<b>Spanish Revolution</b> —Fourteenth Bulletin of the French Army of Spain, Madrid,	
Dec. 5, 1808	48
----- Fifteenth, Madrid, Dec. 7, 1808	52
----- Sixteenth, Madrid, Dec. 8, 1808	54
----- Seventeenth, Madrid, Dec. 10, 1808	56
----- Eighteenth, Madrid, Dec. 12, 1808	59
----- Nineteenth, Madrid, Dec. 13, 1808	60
----- Twentieth, Madrid, Dec. 19, 1808	91
----- Twenty-first, no Date	148
----- Twenty-second, Benevente, Dec. 31, 1808	149
----- Twenty-third, Benevente, Jan. 1, 1809	151
----- Twenty-fourth, Astorga, Jan. 2, 1809	153
----- Twenty-fifth, Benevente, Jan. 5, 1809	316
----- Twenty-sixth, Valladolid, Jan. 7, 1809	318
----- Twenty-seventh, Valladolid, Jan. 9, 1809	320, 350
----- Twenty-eighth, Valladolid, Jan. 13, 1809	351, 416
----- Twenty-ninth, Valladolid, Jan. 16, 1809	459
----- Thirtieth, Valladolid, Jan. 21, 1809	464
----- Thirty-first, no Date	467
----- Thirty-second, no Date	471
----- Thirty-third, Paris, March 9, 1809	472
<b>British Army in Spain</b> —From the London Gazette, Jan. 10, 1809	61
<b>Capitulation of the Town of Rosas</b> , Dec. 5, 1808	86
<b>Spain</b> —Letter of the Supreme Junta to the Marquis de la Romana, Tudela,	
Dec. 4, 1808	86
----- Proclamation of Sir D. Baird, Astorga, Dec. 1, 1808	88
----- Capitulation of Madrid, Dec. 7, 1808	89
----- Proclamation of the Supreme Central Junta, Dec. 23, 1808	91
<b>Portugal</b> —Proclamation of the Government, Dec. 11, 1808	92
<b>America and France</b> —Letter from General Armstrong to Mr. Madison, Paris,	
Aug. 8, 1808	94
----- Letter from Mr. Armstrong to M. Champagny, Aug. 7,	
1808	94
<b>Russia and Sweden</b> —Convention between the Russian Army and that of Sweden	
in Finland, Nov. 18, 1808	96
<b>England</b> —King's Speech at the Opening of the Session of Parliament, Jan. 19,	
1809	120
<b>Spanish Revolution</b> —Proclamations issued in Mexico, Sept. 16, 1808	121
----- Dispatch from the General in Chief of the Army of	
Catalonia, by the Minister of War, Nov. 27, 1808	122
----- O'Neill's Report to General Palafox, respecting the Battle	
of Tudela, Dec. 8, 1808	123
----- General Palafox's Dispatch to the Central Junta, Dec. 3,	
1808	127, 255
----- Letter to the Vice-President of the Supreme Central	
Junta, dated Merida 12th April 1809; and Answer	1031

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page

American States—Letter from Mr. Giles, Member of the Embargo Committee, to Mr. Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, Nov. 11, 1808	127
----- Mr. Gallatin's Answer	128
----- Report of the Embargo Committee	134
----- Report of a Committee of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, upon the subject of the Embargo, Nov. 15, 1808	143
Battle of Corunna—From the London Gazette Extraordinary, Jan. 24, 1809	153
----- Supplement to the above, Jan. 24, 1809	159
Spanish Revolution—Palafax's Proclamation to the Arragonese, Dec. 3, 1808	255, 414
Prussia—Letter of the King to the Magistrates of Berlin, Dec. 24, 1808	459
Cayenne—Capture of Cayenne, Jan. 12, 1809	478
England and Spain—Treaty of Peace between the King of England and Ferdinand 7th, Jan. 14, 1809	506
Swedish Revolution—Proclamation by the Duke of Sudermania, on his assuming the Government, March 13, 1809	510
----- Proclamation of the Commander of the Troops stationed at Weimland	510
----- Proclamation of the Duke of Sudermania, concerning a General Diet, March 14, 1809	543
----- Address of the Duke of Sudermania to the People of Sweden, March 15, 1809	544, 568
Spain—Extract from the last Letter of Sir John Moore to Lord Castlereagh, dated Corunna, Jan. 13, 1809	570
Portugal—General Orders issued by Field Marshal Beresford, March 13, 1809	572
Holland—Decree of the King of Holland, prohibiting all Commerce with England, Utrecht, March 31, 1809	574
Spanish Revolution—Decree of the Supreme Junta, granting no Quarter to the French, Feb. 7, 1809	576, 798
Turkey—Treaty between Great Britain and the Sublime Porte	798
Austria—Proclamation of the Archduke Charles, Vienna, April 6, 1809	825
----- First Bulletin of the French Army, Ratisbon, April 24, 1809	827, 860
----- Second, Muhl'orff, April 27, 1809	862
----- Third, Burghausen, April 30	890
----- Fourth, Brannau, May 1	891
----- Fifth, Fins, May 4	892
----- Sixth, Saint Polten, May 9	895, 945
----- Seventh, Vienna, May 13	945
----- Eighth, Vienna, May 14	948
----- Ninth, Vienna, May 19	952
----- Tenth, Ebersdorff, May 23	954
----- Eleventh, Ebersdorff, May 24	959
----- Twelfth, Ebersdorff, May 26	960, 992
----- Thirteenth, Ebersdorff, May 28	1013
----- Fourteenth, Ebersdorff, June 1	1015
----- Fifteenth, Ebersdorff, June 2	1017
----- Sixteenth, Ebersdorff, June 4	1017
----- Seventeenth, Vienna, June 8	1017
----- Eighteenth, Vienna, June 13	1020
Austria—Second Bulletin of the Austrian Army, Alt Oetting, April 12, 1809	1020
----- Third Bulletin, Vilz Biburg, April 15, 1809	1021
----- Fourth, Landshut, April 16, 1809	1021
----- Fifth, Landshut, April 17, 1809	1022
----- Sixth, Seile, April 17, 1809	1023
----- Seventh Official Report, no Date	1024
----- Eighth Official Report, no Date	1024
----- Tenth Bulletin, no Date	1025
----- Eleventh, no Date	1026
----- Twelfth, Warsaw, April 21, 1809	1026

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	<i>Page</i>
Austrian Army.—Thirteenth Official Report	1027
Fourteenth Bulletin, no Date	1029
America—Orders in Council, relative to the Commerce with the United States, May 24, 1809	858
Spain—Proclamation of the Supreme Governing Junta to the Spanish Nation, May 11, 1809	928
King's Speech to the Parliament at the Close of the Session, June 21, 1809	993
 <b>PROCEEDINGS IN COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &amp;c. RELATIVE TO THE LATE INQUIRY IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, RESPECTING THE CONDUCT OF THE DUKE OF YORK.</b>	
City of Glasgow, March 14, 1809	454
City of Canterbury, March 21	455
City of Westminster, March 29	502
City of London, April 1	517
City of Rochester, March 27	559
City and County of the City of Gloucester, March 29	560
Town of Calne, March 30	561
Town and Borough of Deal, March 30	562
City of Durham, April 5	562
City of London, Common Council, April 6	563
County of Middlesex, April 11	564
Town and Borough of Southwark, April 12	566
Town of Godalming, March 27	640
County of Southampton, April 25	648
Town and Port of Sandwich, April 7	657
Borough of Annan, April 11	658, 700
Borough of Carmarthen, April 5	701
Town of Sheffield, April 12	702
City of Worcester, April 13	703
County of Berks, April 17	725
Town of Northampton, April 17	726
Borough of Derby, April 18	727
Borough of Lewes, April 18	728
Borough of Reading, April 19	729
Town of Kingston upon Hull, April 19	731
Borough of Stafford, April 20	732
Town and County of Poole, April 21	733
Town of Maidstone, April 21	733
Borough of Plymouth, April 24	735
City of Coventry, April 25	735
Town of Liverpool, April 21	785
Borough of Ipswich, April 21	786
Borough of Chipping-Wycombe, April 22	787
County of Monmouth, April 28	788
Stewartry of Kirkudbright, April 29	789
Town of Manchester, May 3	789
Town of Doncaster, May 3	790
Town of Beverley, May 3	791
County of Huntingdon, May 5	792
Town of Guildford, April 25	792
County of Norfolk, May 2	793
Borough of Boston, May 9	795
County of Hereford, May 13	796
Borough of Warwick, May 16	823
County of Cornwall, May 15	824
Town of Blackburn,	854
County of Wilts, May 17	855
City of Bristol, May 26	887
County of Hereford, May 19	888
Town of Huddersfield, May 30	943

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

*Page*

## MISCELLANEOUS.

Hampshire—Mr. Herbert's Address to the Freeholders, &c. of the County of Southampton, Dec. 21, 1808	33
West India Decks—Report from the Committee of Directors on the General Conduct of the Company's Affairs, to the end of the year 1808, Jan. 6, 1809	115
Reverend Mr. Glasse, relative to the Introduction of his Name into the Evidence respecting the Conduct of the Duke of York	314
Sir Francis Burdett's Speech at the Meeting at Westminster Hall, March 30, 1809, for the purpose of thanking Mr. Wardle	535
Dutch Commissioners—Report from the Committee of the House of Commons, relating to the Dutch Commissioners	623
East India Company—Report from the Committee of the House of Commons, on the Patronage of the East India Company, March 23, 1809	658
Parliamentary Reform—Resolutions of the Meeting of the Friends of such a Reform as would secure to the People the Uses and Reality of Representation in Parliament, held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, London, May 1, 1809	686
Petition of Mr. Henry White, Proprietor of the Independent Whig, to the House of Commons, April 24, 1809	692
Report of the Committee who conducted the Westminster Election in 1807, May 23, 1809	820
Articles from the American Papers, relative to the Restoration of Intercourse with America	852
Parliamentary Reform—Speech of the Right Hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons, June 1, 1809, on Mr. Curwen's Reform Bill	865
Parliamentary Reform—Speech of Sir Francis Burdett, Bart. in the House of Commons, June 15, 1809, on a Reform of that House	965
Essex Meeting	1009
Table of the Number of Christenings and Burials; of the Prices of the Quarten Loaf; of the Prices of Meat, Sugar, Salt and Coals; of the Prices of the English and French Stocks; and of the Number of Bankruptcies;.... from Dec. 1808 to May 1809	xii

## ARTICLES BY THE EDITOR.

Court of Inquiry	1
Spain & Revolution.—The Stories from Spain are of a mixed nature.—The <i>Loyal</i> distil from the Corsican's Bulletin.—I believe them.—My reason for so doing.—Description of your true modern Loyalty.—The movements of our Troops have been hitherto quite unaccountable.—Horse Guards Philosophy.—Unless the People of Spain be let loose Bonaparté will prevail	9
Mr. Herbert.—His Address to the Electors of Hampshire worthy of notice.—His answer to the Pledge demanded from him by me.—He declares he never will accept of Pension or Siacure.—But from Place he will not debar himself by any Pledge.—Persons once chosen to be the Guardians of the People's Money should never pocket any part of that Money.—Mr. Herbert thinks it necessary that Members of Parliament should, at the same time, be Servants of the King.—This Doctrine proved to be in direct opposition to the Act of Settlement.—Mr. H. says the Debates would become frivolous if the King's Servants were not in the House. 'The Debates! All is Debate—If the House of Commons contained no Placemen, can it be believed, that the Public Money would not be better taken care off?	33

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

*Page*

<b>Spanish Revolution.—The Extracts from Sir J. Moore's Dispatches shew that our Army is in a perilous situation.—The “Loyal” vomit forth flames of furious Abuse against those who doubt the goodness of the Disposition of the Spanish People. But that Abuse will not alter the Fact.—Spain has been lost from the dread of Liberty.—A Population of 11 Millions is not to be subdued by arms, if they have arms to defend themselves, and hearts to use them</b>	41
<b>Libel Law</b>	45
<b>Spanish Revolution.—What is the fate that will probably attend our Army in Spain?—I, for my part, shall think that we are lucky if we avoid a Capitulation.—What diversion has Sir J. Moore made in favour of the Spaniards?—The sort of diversion that would have been made by Lord Cochrane.—Our Army costs us 23 millions of pounds sterling a year. The regular Infantry in July last amounted to 100,000, and the Cavalry to 25,000 men. What is this Army for?—There can be no maintainable justification for the measures, or the inactivity which have led to the known dreadful situation of our Army. Have not this suffering people a right to demand a knowledge of the cause of this great injury and disgrace?</b>	65
<b>“Loyalty.”—Not vulgar Loyalty, but Loyalty in the modern sense of that Word.—Proofs of this most estimable quality in the Viscount Castlereagh, and some of his Relations.—Three Millions drawn from the Public, during the last 30 or 40 years, by six or seven Persons! There’s Loyalty for you! “Jacobins and Levellers” blush for shame! “Jack Cades” hide your heads.—Real Services of the Cochrane Family</b>	73
<b>Spanish Revolution.—The dismal news is at last arrived.—My Readers, at any rate, have from the first been prepared for what has happened.—Jocularity of the publications which have been made in the Ministerial papers under the title of Speeches made by Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning.—But, while Rome burnt, Nero fiddled; and it is universally true, that the Monkey and the Tyger meet in the same mind.—Shall no disgrace attend those who, having all the means of the Country in their hands, planned the Campaign of Leon and Galicia?—It is grossly false to say that the Spanish Nation did not wish to be freed from Oppression: we never made them the offer. We royalized the Cause of Spain, and made it a contest between King Ferdinand and Joseph.—Dismal close of the Campaign.—Let us never lose sight of this important truth, that to induce a People to rise in arms against a powerful Invader, they must first, not be told, but be made to <i>feel</i>, that they have a Country to fight for</b>	97
<b>West India Docks</b>	103
<b>DUKE OF YORK.—Mr. Wardle's Motion “for the Appointment of a Committee, to inquire into the Conduct of the Commander in Chief, with regard to Promotions and Exchanges in the Army.”—The important DEBATE of the 27th Jan. thereon—Observations on the said Debate.—Mr. Wardle's Speech at once concise, plain, and impressive.—Sir James Pulteney (who marched against Ferrol), and others, extol the excellent Discipline of the Army.—Mr. Adam informs the House that “he had been for 20 Years acquainted with all the Duke's embarrassments, &amp;c” And that therefore the Accusation must be false.—This Conclusion rather illogical.—The “heavy responsibility,” to which Mr. Wardle had subjected himself.—Mr. Canning asserts “that Infamy must attach either upon the Accused or the Accuser.”—A “Conspiracy,” said to be on foot, for the purpose of <i>taking</i> and <i>writing</i> down the Duke of York, the Army itself, and all the Establishments of the Country.—Proofs of the said Conspiracy.—Messrs. Yorke and Canning assert, that there had been a series of <i>Libels</i> published against the Duke of York.—No man's character white-washed by an appeal to the Law.—“The Blessings of a Free Press.”—“What is Freedom of the Press?” The Writers of former times surpassed in boldness those of the present day.—Instances thereof, from the Works of Pope.—Why not put</b>	

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	<i>Page</i>
down those publications? Why not put down the Works of Swift, and Gay, and Garth, and Akenside, and Churchill; nay, of poor Johnson; and of Milton, and Locke, and Paley?—I am resolved, be the consequences to myself what they may, to continue to exercise the Freedom of Writing and of Speaking, as my Forefathers were wont to exercise it, as long as I have my senses and the power of doing either one or the other. As witness my hand, WILLIAM COBBETT.	161
<b>DUKE OF YORK.</b> —An attempt on foot to deprive us of the remains of our Freedom.—A Mr. Wharton, Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, publishes a Pamphlet to inculcate the notion that <i>Jacobinism is revived</i> .—This is an excessively stupid and dirty performance.—My determination to keep the public attention closely nailed to the Inquiry going on relative to the Conduct of the Duke of York.—The Debate of the 27th of January continued.—Mr. Wardle's First Charge respecting the Exchange of Major Brooke.—Examination of Dr. Thynne, Mr. R. Knight, and Mrs. Clarke.—Review of the above Evidence.—Examination of Mr. Adam, Col. Gordon, and Ludowick Orramn.—Second Examination of Mr. Adam.—Mr. Adam produces a threatening Letter written in <i>red ink</i> .—This audacious Letter kindles wrath in the breasts of the Honourable House.—Further Remarks on the cry of “Foul Conspiracy,” and of “Jacobinism.”	193
<b>DUKE OF YORK.</b> —The eyes of every person in the Country directed towards what is going on in the House of Commons.—Effect which these abominations have upon the People in their individual and family capacity.—Mr. Adam's son a Lieutenant Colonel at the age of 21.—The altered language and tone of the House of Commons.—Commencement of the public Complaints made in behalf of the Duke of York against the Press.—“The Plain Statement” ought now to be re-perused and treasured up in the Memory.—Extracts therefrom.—Major Hogan's “Appeal.”—Prosecutions resorted to.—An effectual way of silencing the Press.—“The Duke of Clarence's Birth day” from the Courier Newspaper.—Shocking effect of such examples.—The Debate of the 27th January concluded	225
<b>DUKE OF YORK.</b> —Analysis of the Examinations taken in the House of Commons.—The Adulterous Intercourse.—The Duke's Letters to Mrs. Clarke.—The Annuity.—Establishment in Gloucester Place.—Case of Knight and Brooke.—Case of Captain Maling.—Case of French and Sandon.—Treatment received by Mr. Wardle from the House of Commons	257
<b>DUKE OF YORK.</b> —Remarks on the Re-examination of Miss Taylor.—The Duke of York's Letter to the House of Commons.—Strictures thereon.—Examination of the <i>Set-offs</i> to the Charges and Evidence against the Duke of York.—General traffic for Offices and Places under Government	321
To the Reader, on raising the Price of this Publication from Ten-pence to One Shilling	347
<b>DUKE OF YORK.</b> —The Analysis resumed.—Captain Sandon's Case.—Observations thereon.—Dr. O'Meara's Case.—The Doctor's famous Puff, on his preaching at Weymouth before Royalty.—Miss Taylor's Case	353
<b>DUKE OF YORK.</b> —Observations on a passage in Mr. Adam's Speech relating to my own Conduct respecting his Son.—Debate on the 8th of March.—Mr. Wardle's Address.—Mr. Perceval's Address.—Mr. Banks's Amendment.—What is meant by “personal Corruption.”—Observations on Mr. Wardle's Proposition—And on Mr. Banks's—And on the three Presumptions which have been set up by the Defenders of the Duke.—“Popular Clamour”	385
Subscription for Miss Taylor	412
<b>DUKE OF YORK.</b> —List of the 125 Members who voted for Mr. Wardle's Address.—Observations on the Debate of the 17th of March.—Hopes entertained that the Duke will reform.—Mr. Canning's threat of Infamy.—Mr. Canning alludes to an Anecdote relative to an Ancestor of Lord Folkestone.—Lord Folkestone's reply.—Mr. Canning descended from	

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

*Page*

persons who filled very exalted stations, and acted their parts as well as most people.—“ Set a beggar on horseback and he’ll ride to the Devil.”—Mr. Fuller, “ Those who don’t like England, damn ‘em, let ‘em leave it.”—The Military Club.—Debate of the 20th of March.—The Duke resigns.—Mr. Bragge’s Motion.—Lord Althorpe’s excellent Amendment.—Mr. Whitbread thinks that “ great allowances ought to be made for the failings of princes.” This Doctrine examined.—Thanks to Mr. Wardle	417
Subscription for Miss Taylor	457
DUKE OF YORK.—The Rev. Mr. Glasse.—General Clavering’s Case.—Excellent disposition which has been called forth by the late Disclosures.—Extract from the Oxford Paper.—Necessity of a timely Reform—Family Plate of the Duke de Berri.—My satisfaction at seeing the name of sir H. Mildmay in the List of the 125 who voted with Mr. Wardle.—Westminster Meeting.—Mr. Adam’s Son	481
REFORM.—Mr. Perceval and poor Hamlin the Tinman.—“ Public Justice.”—The Rev. Mr. Beazeley.—London Common Hall.—Mr. Waithman and the Rev. Dawson Warren	513
Spain and Sweden	524
Austria	531
American States	532
Mr. Lyttleton’s Speech	535
Hampshire Meeting.—The Requisition	545
Letter to the People of Hampshire, on the approaching Meeting for the purpose of thanking Mr. Wardle	547
Spain	551
Mr. Wardle and the Whig Club	556
Mrs. Clarke’s Book	557
CASE OF LORD CASTLEREAGH.—Evidence of Mr. Reding, Lord Clancharly, and Lord Castlereagh.—Examination thereof	577
Trading Anti-Jacobins.—Mr. John Bowles the tradesman who has obtained the greatest celebrity—The Political Packwood of the day.—Mr. Green, Mr. Redhead Yorke, and the Rev. Messrs. Nares, and Beloe.—John Bowles begins his Manufactory with a Pamphlet against Tom Paine; and is made by Pitt a Commissioner of Bankrupts.—Establishment of the Weekly Anti-Jacobin Newspaper.—Messrs. Canning, Frere, and Ellis.—Mr. William Gifford.—John Bowles inundates the town with his Anti-Jacobin Pamphlets—And publishes the Moral and Political State of Society, at the end of every year.—John is made a Dutch Commissioner.—Report of the House of Commons respecting the said Commission.—John, and his brother Commissioners, handle the Public Property to the amount of nearly three Millions Sterling.—Take into their pockets a Commission of 5 per cent. upon the Gross Proceeds of their Sales.—Place the Public Money at their own Bankers, and discount private Bills with it.—Their total of Profits 133,198 <i>l.</i> that is 26,639 <i>l.</i> to each Anti-Jacobin.—There’s Loyalty for you!—Extract from the <i>Times</i> Newspaper, in which Paper John used to puff off his Loyalty. “ Oh, John Bowles! John Bowles!”	601
Lord Folkestone’s Motion for a Committee to inquire into the Corrupt Disposal of Offices in the State, &c.	611
Hampshire Meeting for the purpose of thanking Mr. Wardle	641, 681
Letter I. to the Independent People of Hampshire.—Lord Castlereagh and Philip Hamlin	673
Parliamentary Reform.—Resolutions passed at the Crown and Anchor, May 1, 1809	695
Mr. White’s Petition	692
Austria	705
Mr. Madocks’s Motion relative to the Disposal of a Seat in the House of Commons	709
Mr. Curwen’s Reform Bill	721

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	<i>Page</i>
<b>Mr. H. Martin's Motion respecting Places and Pensions</b>	723
Mr. Madocks's Motion—Report of the Debate in the House of Commons, on the 11th of May, 1809, upon the Charge made by Mr. Madocks against Mr. Perceval and Lord Castlereagh, relative to the selling of a Seat in Parliament.—List of the Minority	737
<b>Letter II. to the Independent People of Hampshire—Parliamentary Reform: Introductory Address</b>	773
Wiltshire Meeting	782
Mr. Palmer's Claim	784
<b>Letter III. to the Independent People of Hampshire—Parliamentary Reform: Whether the present State of the Representation be consonant with the Principles of that Constitution, which has so long been the boast of Englishmen?</b>	801
“Elements of Reform”	814
Mr. Curwen's Reform Bill	835
Austria, Spain, and Portugal	843
<b>Another Decision in the House of Commons: Sir John Newport's Motion respecting Mr. Beauchamp Hill</b>	849
American States	850
The Court Martial	851
<b>Parliamentary Reform—Speech of the Right Hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons, June 1, 1809</b>	865
<b>Letter IV. to the Independent People of Hampshire—Parliamentary Reform: What sort of Reform ought to be made?</b>	872
Lord Gambier	884
Austria, Spain and Portugal	885
The Court Martial	886
<b>Letter to the Independent People of Hampshire—THE COURT MARTIAL</b>	897
Parliamentary Reform	919
Austria	920
Sweden	921
Mr. Wardle's Pledge	922
American States	924
Spain	927
<b>Parliamentary Reform—Speech of Sir Francis Burdett in the House of Commons, June 15, 1809, on a Reform of that House—List of the Minority</b>	961
Mr. Wardle's Pledge	981
Essex Meeting	989
The Public Robbers	990
Spanish Sheep	990
Local Militia and German Legion	993
<b>King's Speech at the Prorogation—Not one word in it respecting the affairs of the Duke of York, Lord Castlereagh, H. Wellesley, the Tinman's Prosecutor, and the Irish Exciseman.—A whole Paragraph in the Speech devoted to the Provision which has been made for the Poorer Clergy—Let the List of Non-residents be laid before the Public—Let the Benefits be filled up and there will be no poor Clergy—What will the Provision do?—It appears to be a new scheme for augmenting the ministry's patronage—Let the stall-fed priest, the double-purised pluralist, remember that the poorer Clergy are his brethren—Let him be modest when he appears before us, who have to maintain his kindred—Parson Poulter, Dr. O'Meara, Dr. Locke, the Rev. Mr. Lloyd, the Rev. Mr. Beazeley, and the Crazy Parson, Williams—Talk no more of the tricks and the various base arts of the Methodistical or other Sectarian Priests—There has been scarcely a clergyman in all Hampshire, who has not done his utmost to give countenance to all that the people have been condemning—Let us ascertain whose clutches this money has got into—Let us see what sort of men the “poorer Clergy” are.—The King advises the Members of Parliament to carry with them, into their respective Counties, a disposition to incul-</b>	

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	<i>Page</i>
cate a spirit of attachment to the established Laws and happy Constitution—What the Members will remind us of when they call us together —The Duke of York—Dr. O'Meara and his Celestial Unction—The Duke acquitted—The War-whoop about a Jacobin Conspiracy—The Threat of Infamy—The Shop for the Sale of Offices under Government —Lord Castlereagh—Mr. Madocks's Motion—Peter Hamlin—Mr. Curwen's Reform Bill.—The Speech talks of the Buonapartés <i>atrocious</i> and <i>unparalleled</i> act of Violence towards the Spanish Nation—I never can allow it to be <i>unparalleled</i> —Our spite against the Buonapartés is so great, that we forget the misconduct of every body else.—The Deliverance of Europe—The Expedition—“Formidable Insurrections against Buonaparté” —And against the Emperor Alexander—Would the destruction of Buonaparté be an unequivocal good ? My conviction is that it would not.—If the people of this country enjoy their rights, Buonaparté never can invade us with success—But on we shall go in the old way—The War, with our Government, has long been a War of <i>Passion</i> . Reason and Policy have no longer any thing to do with it. It is a War against Napoleon's Person	994

## TABLES.

TABLE of the Number of CHRISTENINGS and BURIALS within the Bills of Mortality, from December 1808, to May 1809, inclusive.

Epochs.	CHRISTENED		BURIED.													
	Male.	Female	Under 2 Years.	2 to 5 Years.	5 to 10 Years.	10 to 20 Years.	20 to 50 Years.	50 to 400 Years.	400 to 500 Years.	500 to 600 Years.	600 to 700 Years.	700 to 800 Years.	800 to 900 Years.	900 to 1000 Years.	Total Buried.	Males Females
December .....	953	905	302	258	58	74	160	150	182	150	128	102	44	6	903	894
January .....	759	788	432	144	63	37	82	92	145	117	122	90	56	2	693	674
February .....	727	702	411	193	67	38	99	135	150	148	132	100	41	3	790	728
March .....	919	883	506	182	57	50	119	145	200	180	125	121	40	6	914	818
April .....	808	816	381	161	76	52	105	126	154	115	111	96	52	4	769	698
May .....	765	751	408	144	49	44	79	109	142	108	113	101	92	6	702	634
	4,931	4,853	2,640	1,083	402	295	580	760	973	824	740	617	221	27	4,771	4,449
Total Christ <sup>ings</sup> ...	9,786														Total Burials... 9,220	

Table of the Prices of MEAT, SUGAR, SALT, and COALS, in LONDON, from December 1808, to May 1809, inclusive.

	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	April	May	per Stone of 8lb. to sink the oilfish.
	s. d.						
Beef....	5 6	5 8	6 0	6 4	6 6	6 8	6 4
Mutton.	6 0	6 0	6 4	6 6	6 4	6 6	6 4
Pork ...	6 0	6 4	7 0	6 8	6 8	6 8	6 4
Sugar...	49 8	50 7	49 0	49 4	44 4	44 8	38 10
Salt.....	1 0	0 1	0 0	1 0	0 0	1 0	1 0
Coals ...	55 3	58 9	55 0	57 6	60 6	55 0	Chald.

Table of the Prices of the QUARTERN LOAF in LONDON, from December 1808 to May 1809, inclusive.

Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May
	Dav.	Price.	Dav.	Price.	Dav.
6 1	2 2	4 1	2 2	5 1	2 2
6 1	2 2	4 1	2 2	5 1	2 2
13 1	2	11 1	2	8 1	2
20 1	2 1	18 1	2 1	15 1	2 1
27 1	2 1	25 1	2 1	21 1	2 1

Table of the Prices of the English Three per Cent. Consols, from Dec. 1808, to May 1809, inclusive.

Day.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	April	May.
1	67 1	—	67 2	67 3	67 4	67 4
2	65 2	67 2	66 2	67 3	67 4	67 4
3	66 1	67 2	67 2	67 3	67 4	67 4
4	—	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4	67 4
5	66 2	67 2	—	67 3	67 4	67 4
6	67	—	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
7	66 2	67 1	66 3	67 2	67 3	67 4
8	67	—	66 1	67 1	67 2	67 3
9	66 1	65 1	66 2	67 1	67 2	67 3
10	—	65 2	65 1	67 1	67 2	67 3
11	—	65 1	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
12	66 1	65 1	—	67 1	67 2	67 3
13	67	65 1	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
14	66	—	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
15	66	—	—	67 1	67 2	67 3
16	66 1	65 1	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
17	66 2	65 1	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
18	—	—	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
19	66 3	65 1	67 2	67 3	67 4	67 4
20	66 2	65 1	—	67 1	67 2	67 3
21	—	65 1	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
22	67	—	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
23	66 1	—	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
24	66	—	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
25	—	67 1	67 2	—	67 3	67 4
26	—	66	—	—	67 3	67 4
27	—	66	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
28	66 1	67 1	67 1	—	67 3	67 4
29	66 1	—	67 1	67 2	67 3	67 4
30	66 1	—	—	67 1	67 2	67 3
31	66 1	—	—	—	67 3	67 4

Table of the Prices of the French Five per Cent. Consolides, from Dec. 1808, to May 1809, inclusive.

Day.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	April	May
1	—	—	—	80.25	—	—
2	—	—	—	—	—	—
3	—	—	—	—	—	81.50
4	—	—	—	—	—	—
5	—	—	80.15	—	—	—
6	—	—	—	—	—	—
7	—	—	—	—	—	—
8	—	—	—	—	—	—
9	—	—	—	80.75	—	—
10	—	—	—	—	—	81.75
11	—	—	—	—	—	82.10
12	—	—	80.16	—	—	—
13	—	—	—	—	—	—
14	—	—	—	—	—	—
15	—	80.25	—	—	81.50	82.0
16	—	—	—	—	—	82.50
17	—	—	—	—	—	—
18	—	—	—	—	—	—
19	—	—	—	—	—	—
20	—	80.56	—	—	81.0	—
21	—	—	80.12	—	81.75	82.10
22	—	—	—	—	—	—
23	—	—	80.20	—	—	—
24	—	—	—	—	—	—
25	—	—	—	—	—	—
26	—	—	—	—	—	—
27	—	80.75	—	—	81.10	82.15
28	—	—	—	—	—	81.50
29	—	—	—	—	—	—
30	—	—	80.56	—	—	—
31	—	—	—	—	—	—

Table of the Number of BANKRUPTCHES in England, from Dec. 1808, to May 1809, inclusive.

December.....	90	January.....	84	February .....	87	March.....	92	April .....	101	May.....	88
---------------	----	--------------	----	----------------	----	------------	----	-------------	-----	----------	----

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 1.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1809. [PRICE 10D.

" The interposition of the City of London was not necessary for inducing me to direct due inquiry to be made into a transaction, which has disappointed the hopes and expectations of the nation."—KING'S ANSWER TO THE CITIZENS OF LONDON.

[1]

[2]

## SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

COURT OF INQUIRY.—Of this Court, or Board, or whatever else the ministers and the members may choose to call it, it may be truly said, and I do say it without grudging, that it has not "disappointed the 'hopes and expectations of the nation ;'" for, in this whole kingdom, there was not one living soul, who expected from it any thing satisfactory.—The *Report* of the members will be found in another part of this sheet; which report, after a very dull narrative of facts, with which every one was *before acquainted*, concludes with the expression of an *unanimous* opinion, that no further military inquiry or proceeding, relative to the conduct of any of the generals, concerned in the transaction, is necessary; and that for this very curious reason, that they had, during the whole of the service, discovered great.....great what? Great *courage* and *skill*? No: but great "zeal and firmness."—A man who simply utters his opinion has afterwards to be heard as to his reasons for that opinion; but, here we have both the opinion and the reason; and such a reason, such a ground, for such a decision, was, I am fully persuaded, never heard of before, since any thing like judicial inquiries have made a part of the practices of mankind.—What the nation deemed a great military fault, or crime, had been committed; a great national wrong had been deemed to have been done by some one of three generals, or by all the three together; the king, after waiting for the calls of his people, causes a board of General Officers to be assembled to inquire into the matter; and, as the acts, which were deemed criminal, consisted of an Armistice and a Convention, they were charged to ascertain, and to state to the king, what was the nature of those acts, the fact of the acts having been committed by the parties being notorious and undeniable. Now, who would not have expected from these generals an expression of their opinion upon the nature of those acts? Who would not have expected to see the Report concluded with a regular deduction from the evidence, as to this particular

point? Who would not have expected these men, versed in the art military, to say, "from this evidence, it appears to us, "that the acts were good (or bad); and "that, therefore, we think, that no further, (or some further) proceedings are necessary, in this case?" Who would not have expected a decision in this way? Instead of which, we have, and the king has been mortified, not to say insulted, with a heavy narrative of transactions, before known in substance, and quite uninteresting and fatiguing in the detail; to which narrative is added no decision, or opinion, with regard to the acts, which the whole nation had deemed a wrong done to its interest and its honour; and yet, we are told, by these same inquirers, that no further proceedings are necessary; because, during the whole of the service, great "zeal and firmness" were displayed by the parties accused.—If, indeed, those parties had been accused of a want of zeal or of firmness, then there would have been some sense in this decision; but, they were accused of no such thing. Zeal and firmness are mere qualities of the mind. These generals were accused of *acts*; of what, in the jargon of the law, are called overt acts; of what, in plain language, are rightly called, open and visible acts: namely, the making of an *Armistice* and a *Convention*. What had their general zeal and firmness, supposing them to possess those mental qualities, and to have displayed them in Portugal, to do with the commission of these acts? The Court might as well have reported, that they found Sir Arthur Wellesley and his associates to have been excellent psalm singers, and that, therefore, they saw no necessity for any further proceedings, relative to the Conventions, which those gentlemen had made in Portugal. The absurdity of such a reason would have been a little more flagrant than that given by the Court of Inquiry; but, it would not, in the smallest degree, have been more absurd in reality. If a man, accused of high-way robbery were to be acquitted upon the ground of his having a black or a yellow beard, the acquittal would not be less con-

A

sonant with reason, than was the decision now under our observation. Any thing so preposterous has, surely, never before made its appearance under the sun.—In this light it, at once, appeared to the Duke of York, who, as will be seen by his letter, sets the board to work again, and explicitly asks them for their opinion respecting the Armistice and the Convention. Now, then, they are obliged to speak in intelligible language. The majority say, *without giving any reasons*, that they approve of both; two of the members say, that they disapprove of the Convention; and one of them, Lord Moira, giving very satisfactory reasons for his disapprobation, disapproves of both those acts. Yet, only a few days before, these members, as well as the majority of the Court, had set their hands to a Report, which concluded, with an expression of their unanimous opinion, that no further proceedings, against the parties accused, were necessary. The majority of the Court; that is to say, those members who approved of the acts, might, by possibility, have, in their minds, good reasons for their decision on both days; their conduct was, at least, consistent; but, where will the public find, where will it look for, arguments to make out the consistency of the disapproving members, especially that of the Earl of Moira; who, to-day, gives most excellent reasons for his disapprobation of the acts committed, who shews that those acts were injurious to the nation and its allies; who also shews, that there was no necessity for committing them; and who further shews, that the plain path of duty led directly another way: where shall we seek for the consistency of him, who, to-day, does this, and who, but yesterday, declared, that no further proceedings against the parties were necessary?—Such has been the result of this far-famed Court of Inquiry with all its solemnity and all its bundles, its bales, of evidence. I said, at the outset, that its proceedings would exceed in bulk the Old and New Testaments; and, the court news-writers now inform us, that the Duke of York took down the papers, to Windsor, in his travelling carriage, they consisting of two packages of twenty pounds weight each, written, of course, upon about seventy or eighty quires of foolscap paper. This is to be our “satisfaction,” is it? Each of the petitioning counties is to have a quire or two, is it, of these precious, and dearly purchased papers?—The question now is, *what will the people do?* At almost, if not all, the meetings, where the Address to the king for inquiry met with opposition, it was declared

by the opposers, that, if a *satisfactory investigation did not take place*, they would be amongst the foremost to petition the king for such an investigation. Well, then, will they say, that this investigation is satisfactory? Will any one man, of any pretensions to integrity, dare to say this, in the face of those who know him, and whom he is liable to meet again? Will any such person say, that, either in the kind or constitution of the Court; or in its proceedings, or its Report, he can see any thing to *satisfy* him? Will any such man say, that a Court, consisting of unsworn members; having to examine unsworn witnesses; without any power to compel either the giving of evidence or even of attendance; the witnesses being all, more or less, parties concerned; and the questions put in writing, with time in abundance allowed for the several witnesses to frame their answers and previously to confer with each other upon all and every point: Will any man, pretending to character for integrity, seriously say, that an acquittal by such a Court, so proceeding, is, or can be, satisfactory to his mind?—Come, then, you, who before opposed petitions for inquiry, and let us hear what ground it is, upon which you will now oppose petitions for an inquiry of a more efficient nature. Is this that has taken place all that you expected, or wished for? You said the contrary. You told us, that satisfactory inquiry was promised; and, in order to silence us, you asserted, that that promise ought to be looked upon as *the king's*, and not as *his ministers'*; and that, to appear to doubt its sincerity was to insult the king, “in *his old age*”; the king's age having, according to your ideas of the constitution, very much to do with the matter. We, who imputed the Answer, given to the City of London; we who imputed this answer to the ministers, have no scruple to say, that “due inquiry” has not been made; that the implied promise, advised by the ministers, has not been kept and fulfilled; we say, and you cannot deny, that the report, that the result is not satisfactory; and, therefore, if all our small remains of spirit and of national feeling have not evaporated, we shall now put your sincerity to the test.—Will you now oppose a petition, not upon the ground that you are satisfied, but that the matter has been taken up by, and ought to be left in the hands of, the king? Why, this argument, if admitted here, would be good against almost every petition, which, upon any occasion, could be drawn up, or of which an idea could be formed. It would have been full as good against the City of

London, before any promise of inquiry had been made; for, was not the matter already in the hands of the king? Suppose a proclamation to be issued for the cutting off of all our ears, would you not petition against it, because the matter was in the hands of the king? Would you quietly have your ears cut off, rather than trouble the king with your "interference"? I know you will say, "yes," if the pulling out of a tooth or two were added, provided your sinecures and contracts were left untouched; but, that can never be the general taste.—To suppose it to be an insult to the king to request him to do that which he has power to do, and does not do, is of the very essence of slavery. It is, at once, to give up, to censure, to stigmatize, the vital principles of the constitution of England. Every man, be he who or what he may, has a right to petition the king; that is to say, he has the right, not only to state to the king what he thinks to be a wrong done, or about to be done, to him individually, or to the community, of which he is a member, but also to complain of that wrong, and to ask for redress. The wrong, (real or imaginary no matter about that) if of a public nature, must necessarily proceed from some person, or persons, having his or their authority from the king; with the king it rests to reprove, or punish, those who abuse the trust with which he invests them; so that, if it be to insult the king; if to ask him to use his power in this way; if this be to insult him by imputing to him a want of discernment or of justice; if this be to "insult our good king, in his old age," why, then, there is, at once, an end to the right of petition, guaranteed to the subject by so many acts of parliament, established by so many hundreds of legal precedents; this boasted right, this last resort of the suffering subjects, is become a farce, and a farce not at all the less despicable on account of its solemnity.—We often see petitions presented to the parliament against bills pending before it. The people, or a part of them, think that what they learn is about to be passed into a law will be injurious to them; and, they pray the parliament, that the same may not become a law. But, do we ever hear one of these petitions called an "*insult*" to the parliament? Do we hear it imputed to the petitioners, that they question the discernment, or the justice, of either of the Houses? Yet, the parliament have "taken the matter up"; the thing is in their hands; and quite as completely as the affair of the Conventions is now in the hands of the king.

When an *impeachment* has been before the House of Commons; when the House has proceeded upon it; when it is in the course of proceeding further, or when it has stayed its proceedings: in these cases, under these circumstances, the people present petitions to the House, praying it to go on, and to do this, or that, in the affair, according to the views and opinions of the petitioners. This is a case exactly in point; yet, we have never heard the petitioners, in such a case, accused of insulting the House, and of casting upon it insinuations of a want of knowledge or of integrity.—Whence, then, this new doctrine about *insulting the king*, because we humbly pray him to do that which appears to us to be for the public good, and which it is not denied that he has the power to do?—The fact is, that this doctrine is a mere pretence, invented for the sole purpose of screening ministers, or their favourites and supporters, and totally void of feeling of respect for, or attachment to, the person, or the office of the king, whose name is thus abused, whose dignity is thus vilified, and the hearts of whose subjects must, if this doctrine were to succeed, be thus completely alienated. Establish this doctrine, and you, at once, cut off all valuable and esteemed communication between king and people; as flatterers, as slaves, they may still approach him; but, never for that purpose, that *sole* purpose, the answering of which can make them value the kingly office; never for the purpose of obtaining redress for the past, or security for the future, can they again address him, and the loyal sentiment of the poet, "I flee from petty 'tyrants to the throne," becomes a ranting and senseless exclamation.—The Report of the Court of Inquiry has, in no wise, changed my opinion as to the nature of the Armistice and Convention; and, I think, that so it is with the public in general. It still appears, that Sir Arthur Wellesley says he could have pursued and shut up Junot with only 13,000 men; that Junot had only 14,000 men in the field when he made his attack and was repulsed; that, as to the rest of Junot's army, they were not soldiers fit for battle, but mere Buckram men, who must have been a burthen to him; that our army was in no real want, or in any danger of being in want of provisions; that it consisted of 35,000 men before the Convention was signed; and, that, therefore, the Convention was injurious and disgraceful, and the Armistice still more injurious and disgraceful. The fatal consequences of these acts are now evident. It is impossible to believe, that if we had captured the whole of Junot's army, the im-

pression in Spain would not have been very different from what it has been ; and that, as to Portugal, we should not, in that case, have been upon quite another footing than what we now are. It is clear, that, since the signing of the Convention, the Portuguese have disliked our army ; that they have harboured suspicions injurious to it ; they have wished it away ; in short, that they have been very little better than open enemies. How different would all this have been ; how different would the impression have been in all Europe, and particularly in *Ireland*, if we had brought Junot and his army prisoners to *England* ; which no one denies that we could have done, all the dispute being about the pitiful circumstance of time ; three weeks sooner, or three weeks later. That army, which we have carried to France, and there put down, ready equipped for battle ; that army, which is now actually in Spain, and which may, possibly assist in capturing the very men, before whom they fled at Vimeira ; that army, it is now evident to every one, might have been safely lodged in the prisons of England, while the Russian fleet was brought prizes and their crews prisoners to Spithead, instead of the latter being carried, at our expense, to fight against our ally in the Baltic ; all this, it is now evident, might have been done, without, in the smallest degree, retarding any assistance that we had to give to the Spaniards. And yet, we are told, by this Court of Inquiry, that nothing beyond their unmeaning, and, in part, contradictory Report, is necessary to give us satisfaction ; while, on the other hand, with lungs of Stentor and with front of brass, the hiring writers of the day are calling upon us for new and greater sacrifices in support of this "just and necessary war." *Cavalry and artillery ! Good God ! As if we did not pay for enough ! An army that cost for the last year, upwards of twenty millions of pounds sterling, out of which above four millions went for ordnance ; such endless trains of horses and waggons and equipage of all sorts ; a country full of barracks and magazines and laboratories ; every town full of soldiers and horses ; the drum and the trumpets stunning us, and the country shaded with clouds of military dust from April to October : and, with all these means, with all this warlike parade and bustle and clutter and expense before our eyes, are we, in good earnest, to be quieted, by being told, that our army of 35,000 men failed to capture 14,000 Frenchmen for the want of horse and artillery, and that, too, in a country where, it is notorious, all the people were our friends, and all the en-*

mies of the French ? If so, if we really are thus to be quieted, it matters very little who are our commanders, who are our rulers, or what either of them do. Tell us not that the horses were at Chichester or at Cork, and that the cannon were at Woolwich. What is that to us ? They should have been where they were wanted. It was the business of some of you to see that they were there. You had a thousand ships of war at your command ; the transports for the year will cost us two millions of pounds sterling ; you might have shipped off one half of the whole nation in the ships at your command ; and now you tell us a whining story about a want of horse and artillery. What are your bickerings to us ? What is it to us, who amongst you are to blame ? It is some of you. You have an army, be it what it may, that costs us 23 millions a year ; and, after all, where is this army ? If Spain was to be defended, why was not this army in Spain, time enough to meet Buonaparte ? What is this army for ? For what do we pay all this money ; this sum, at the contemplation of which the brain turns ? Where is it wanted but where the enemy is to be met and fought ?

—These, and the like, are the proper questions for the people of England to put. It is not for us to be amused with tales of wants ; a want of this, or a want of that. Where 23 millions a year is paid for the support of an army, that army should want nothing, especially in the day of battle. It is quite beneath us ; it is to assist in abusing and cheating ourselves, to enter at all into the squabbles between ministers and generals. It signifies not a straw to us who is to blame. The blame, where there is any, is amongst them ; and we have a right to complain, and to expect redress.—This is my view of the matter. The petition that I would present to the king, should express, or be built upon, sentiments like these. I would complain to him, that, after all our sacrifices for the support of such an immense military establishment, I saw little attempted against the enemy, and less effected ; that, whenever the army was concerned, there generally appeared some deficiency in those things for which we pay so dearly ; that the time for action seemed, in almost every instance, to have passed by before we began to act ; that the armies of the conqueror of Europe were distinguished by a conduct exactly the contrary ; that to oppose him with effect it seemed requisite for us to adopt a new line of conduct ; and that, before all other things, it appeared necessary to cause a further and more efficient inquiry to be made into the causes of the

late Conventions in Portugal.—Who is there that does not entertain these sentiments? Not a man in the whole kingdom, who can be said to entertain any sentiments at all upon the subject; and, I verily believe, that there are none, (except a few wretched parasites) who, in *private* conversation, will affect to entertain different sentiments thereon. But, when it comes to *speaking out*; when it comes to voting, or even holding up hands; then you perceive, at once, the effect of that chain of dependence, which the Whigs of the Revolution first forged by means of the funding and taxing system, and which has been, in subsequent, and especially in recent times, so strengthened, and so lengthened, as to embrace and hold fast, or to shackle, at least, almost every soul in society. Were it not for this, is it possible, that we should see the torpor that now prevails? Is there any instance, in any part of our history, no matter under what trace of kings, of the people's appearing so insensible to their situation as they appear at this moment? Were there ever before found Englishmen so base as to defend acts such as are now openly defended? How this will and must end, and that, too, at no very distant day, unless a salutary constitutional reform speedily take place, it is much easier to foresee than it is safe to describe.—Whether the people should now petition the king, or the parliament, may be a question with some; though, for my own part, I should certainly be for the former, as well as for the latter. But, that those who petitioned before are bound to do it now, I think, nobody will attempt to deny. All the former motives still exist, with the addition of those which naturally arise out of what has since taken place, in relation to the subject, both at home and abroad. By bringing the matter before parliament, we shall see who, in that body, will stand up in defence of the Conventions; and, what is of far greater importance, we shall ascertain in what degree the House of Commons, the people's House of Parliament, *participate in the feelings of the people*, it being impossible for the most impudent man in existence to deny, that, upon the subject of the Portugal Conventions, the people of England were, and are, unanimous in a feeling of indignation.

**SPANISH REVOLUTION.**—One of the newspapers has observed, that the intelligence from Spain is of a “mixed nature;” “a good deal *chequered*.” I must confess, that I can, after a pretty attentive perusal of all the public, and of some private, intelligence, perceive none of this chequer-

work. It all appears to me very plain; and much too plain to give me any portion of that “*sincere satisfaction*,” which an editor of last evening appears to have felt, or, that he has, at least, done his best to make his readers feel.—In ROMANA's powers and proclamation I see much of dread and of despair, but not a glimpse of confidence or of hope; and, I see still less of either in the “*oath*” not to surrender Cadiz and the fleet. I remember the *oath of Potsdam*, and, remembering it, I must beg to be excused, if I entertain a strong suspicion of the efficacy of oaths as opposed to the arms of Buonaparté.—The stories, indeed, from Spain are of a “mixed nature;” for those which come from Corunna widely differ from those which come from other ports not in the hands of the enemy. But, why should we *deceive ourselves*? This is the foolishest of all things; and I am utterly astonished, that such prints as the *Times* and the *Morning Chronicle*, for instance, should publish as intelligence, unaccompanied with suitable comment, statements of facts, which their editors must know to be false, the effect of which must be to aggravate the public disappointment.—The news from Corunna talks of a *desperate defence of Madrid*, and gives us the detail, with all the coolness imaginable, just about a week after we have received the account of Madrid's having surrendered at discretion.—“Oh!” says the *loyal* man, “what, you ‘believe the Corsican's bulletins, do you?’” Yes. I do believe them; and you shall have my reason for it, in a few words. I have read these bulletins during three wars; not three campaigns; but three distinct wars, each of them ending in the conquest of kingdoms, or principalities; and, though, as to little matters of detail, they have sometimes been incorrect, or false, if you like that word better, they have uniformly proved *substantially true*, to the woeful experience of those, who, as well as ourselves, have affected to treat them as lies. *Loyalty*, as was observed a week or two ago; your true modern loyalty, consists, in part, of a little fingering in the public purse; but another essential ingredient of it is, a total disbelief in any of the victories of Buonaparte, till, like a thunder clap, they break over our heads, after having been kept off as long as possible by means, such as those used by Messrs. Ward and Huskisson previous to that terrific clap, the battle of Austerlitz.—I am satisfied, that we are the most credulous nation, particularly the Cockney part of us, of any at this day existing in the

world. The Spanish peasants, it is true, believe that the Dolls, stuck up in their village chapels, work miracles in the cure of tooth-ache, rheumatism, incontinence, sterility, and other cases; but, then, those Dolls are made in Holland; whereas we swallow the byrefaced lies, which are fabricated here at home, and fabricated too, in so slovenly a manner as not to cover any part of the hook. Fish in the river St. John are so eager for the bait, that, after the first time, they will bite at, and swallow, the naked wire; but, we, still more eager, want no bait at all. We take in, with great self-complacency, lie after lie during the whole of a campaign; and when, at last, by a long series of defeats and disgraces, Buonaparte has conquered another kingdom, we talk about the result with just as little surprize as if it had come gradually upon us through the channel of truth. Now, what sense is there in this? A great deal of *modern loyalty* there, doubtless, is; but, what *sense* is there in it? — To give any opinion as to what will be the result of the engagement, or engagements, towards which, apparently, our army, in Spain, was, when the last intelligence came away, fast approaching, would be foolish; because, in fact, we *know* just nothing at all about either the relative strength, or relative position of the hostile armies. All that I can decidedly express upon the subject is a wish, and that wish is, that whenever and wherever and against whomsoever Englishmen fight they may be victorious; but, I must confess, that this wish is accompanied, in the present instance, with most serious apprehensions. The movements of our troops have hitherto, if our intelligence be correct, been quite unaccountable; and, as to Sir David Baird's Proclamation of the 1st of December, I trust it will prove to be a forgery; for, if true, it will require more than a whole life of glory to wipe it away. There are, perhaps, few persons who have stronger reasons than I have to be anxious about the safe return of the individuals composing that part of our army; but, much rather than hear of their sneaking out of Spain without daring to look the French in the face, I would hear of their being, to the last man, cut to pieces upon the plain. "No tears are so sweet as those which bedew the unburied head of the soldier;" and no stain so foul as that of military cowardice. To draw off, leaving the Spanish peasants, whom we had encouraged to take up arms; to skulk away, at the approach of the French, still encouraging those poor creatures to expose themselves to the

sabres of which we were afraid, and to do this, too, under a false pretence! Oh, God! it would have been an act of infamy, the very thought of bearing a share of which would turn one wild. I hope, nay, I trust I may say, that I am sure, that there is not one single native of this kingdom, who does not contemplate such an act with inexpressible horror. Every other evil, when compared with this, is a blessing. Therefore, let what will happen else, slaughter, capture, total destruction; any thing is consoling in exchange for this. The country may lose the flower of its army, and individuals amongst us may lose brothers and sons and fathers and friends; but, neither the dead nor the living will be stained with that dishonour, which, to a mind rightly constructed, would have rendered life insupportable. The very worst of all our acts, during the last war, was the abandonment of the French Emigrants at Guadalupe. I trust we shall never see the like repeated. I know not their philosophy at the Horse Guards, or at the Military College; but, I know that it ought to teach, that one part of the duty, which a soldier owes his country, is, *to die*, and that, too, at any time when his death will be more serviceable than his life, which is always the case when the choice lies between death and the chance of dishonour. If a man cannot sit down, by the side of his wife surrounded with his children, and coolly screw his mind up to this pitch, his money, intended for the purchase of commissions, he would do well to apply to the purchase of "consols," or of sugar and plumbs, to be sold by retail. — I hope, there will come some circumstance to explain; satisfactorily to explain, the cause of Sir David Baird's Proclamation, if it should prove to be authentic; but, I must confess, that it is with extreme reluctance, that I admit even the possibility of its being genuine. — If our army should gain a battle, though against only a comparative small part of the French force, it may have a wonderful effect upon the Spaniards, and may lead to important results; but, unless the people be completely *let loose*; unless the war assume a revolutionary turn, still, in my opinion, Buonaparte will prevail. It appears to me to be morally impossible, that he should be beaten by any other means. The only article of really cheering news that I can collect out of all that I have lately read about the operations in Spain, is contained in one of Buonaparte's bulletins. It is that in which he says, that all the *respectable*, or *genteel*, people are for him, and none but

the *rabble* against him. This language of his being exactly like that of our peculators and plunderers, there is some ground to hope, that he has all these on his side, in Spain, and, of course, that the people are against him. The Morning Chronicle has, with much acuteness, noticed this exhilarating circumstance, and has observed, that, if the fact be so, it is a little awkward for the doctrine of those amongst us, who are so eager to contend, that the people, or rabble, as they call them, are every where the allies of Buonaparte. But, my great fear is, that the peculators are against him, and that the "rabble" are for him.— Some persons, anticipating a failure in Spain, are making for themselves a consolation in the new possessions and sovereignty, that we shall, in that case, have in the Spanish colonies, including, of course, all the gold and silver mines. I beseech them to dismiss this busy devil from their thoughts; for, in the first place, we should not get those possessions and that sovereignty without long and bloody wars; and, in the next place, they would, if we had them, be an addition to the many burthensome colonies we already have. They would, in short, be *another East-Indies*, and that is, in one compound word, to express all manner of national corruptions, calamities, and curses.

*Westminster, 5th January, 1809.*

#### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

CONVENTION IN PORTUGAL.—*Report of the Board of Inquiry to the King, dated Dec. 22, 1808. Also the subsequent Proceedings of the said Board.*

May it please your majesty.—We the under-written general officers of the army, in obedience to your majesty's warrant, which bears date the 1st day of November, 1808, commanding us strictly to inquire into the conditions of a *suspension of arms*, concluded on the 22d of August, 1808, between your majesty's army in Portugal, and the French force in that country—and also into a definitive convention, concluded with the French general commanding on the 31st August following—also into all the causes and circumstances (whether arising from the previous operation of the British army, or otherwise which led to them)—and into the conduct, behaviour and proceedings of lieutenant general sir Hew Dalrymple, and such other commander or commanders of your majesty's forces in Portugal—and of any other person or persons, as far as the same were connected with the said armistice, suspension of arms, and convention—and

to report to your majesty a state thereof, as it shall appear, together with our opinion thereon, and also our opinion, whether any, and what farther proceedings should be had thereupon.—We have, at several meetings, perused and considered your majesty's orders and instructions, as transmitted to us by the right hon. lord Castlereagh, your majesty's principal secretary of state, together with sundry letters, and other papers, therewith transmitted: and have heard and examined lieutenant general sir Hew Dalrymple, Sir Harry Burrard, and Sir Arthur Wellesley, and other principal officers employed on the said expedition, with such witnesses as any of them desired: and also such other persons as seemed to us most likely to give any material information: and in order that your majesty may be fully possessed of every circumstance which has appeared in the course of this inquiry,— We beg leave to lay before your majesty the whole of our examinations and proceedings to this our report annexed. And upon the most diligent and careful review of the whole matter, we do, in further obedience to your royal command, most humbly report to your majesty.—That it appears that early in the month of May, 1808, a very considerable force destined for foreign service, was assembled near Cork, the command of which, it is imagined, was intended for Sir Arthur Wellesley.—That in the month of May, universal and unexpected resistance to French tyranny had taken place in Spain.—That application was made for the assistance of Britain, and that government with the universal concurrence of the country, determined on giving Spain and Portugal, then also in commotion, the most effectual aid.—It appears, that in consequence of such determination major general Spencer, before the surrender of the French fleet at Cadiz, was off that port with about 5,000 men, sent by sir Hew Dalrymple from Gibraltar. His assistance not having been called for there, he proceeded to the mouth of the Tagus, with a view of aiding sir Charles Cotton's fleet in forcing a passage; it having been represented that there were not in the forts and about Lisbon, more than four thousand men. But general Spencer being then off the Tagus (June 24) reports from the best authority he could have, that the enemy had 11,000 men in and about Lisbon, and 9,500 at St. Ubes, the east of Portugal, and elsewhere. In this situation the intended attack could not take place, and general Spencer returned to Cadiz and Gibraltar.— It appears that on the 14th June, application was made to the Admiralty to provide a

convoy to sail with the troops then under orders from Cork, on the arrival of lieutenant general sir Arthur Wellesley, appointed to the command.—On the 21st June, lord Castlereagh acquaints sir Arthur Wellesley that accounts from Cadiz are bad, and general Spencer was returning to Gibraltar, and that the cabinet postpone their instructions to him till more is known.—On the 28th of June, lord Castlereagh acquaints general Spencer, then supposed at Gibraltar, that Sir Arthur Wellesley, with nine thousand men, is ordered to proceed from Cork, and to act with his (Spencer's) corps, in support of the Spanish nation. He is, therefore, with his corps, to go off to Cadiz to wait for him; in the meantime, availing himself of any circumstance that offers of acting to advantage, even within the Straits.—It appears that, on the 12th July, lieut. general sir Arthur Wellesley sailed from Cork with 9,000 men, (under instructions of the 30th June) generally to aid the Spanish nation, and the principal object to attack the French in the Tagus; but authorised, as he understood, to pursue any other object, if more likely to conduce to the benefit of the two nations. And, (of the 15th July) to endeavour, if possible, not only to expel the enemy from Lisbon, but to cut off their retreat towards Spain. He arrived at Corunna the 20th, communicated with the Gallician Junta, who wished the troops to be employed in expelling the French from Portugal, and recommended him to land in that country (this was on the 26th communicated to general Spencer). Sailed from Corunna the 22d, went to Oporto, (leaving the fleet off Cape Finisterre); arrived the 24th, desired by sir Charles Cotton to leave the troops at Oporto or Mondego bay, and come to the Tagus to communicate. Had a conference with the generals and bishop, at Oporto, about the disposal of their force. The bishop promised mules and other means of carriage, and also a sufficiency of slaughter cattle.—It appears that sir Arthur Wellesley sailed from Oporto the 25th July, ordered the transports to go to Mondego, proceeded and joined the admiral off the Tagus the 26th. Letters were received from general Spencer at Cadiz, which had returned, and where the Spaniards pressed him to remain, and he expected orders from sir Arthur Wellesley. Agreed with sir Charles Cotton, that landing in the mouth of the Tagus was impracticable, and unadvisable, as there was great risk from the state of the surf, from the defences and adverse nature of the coast, and from the neighbourhood of the

enemy's whole disposable force, to whose attack we should be exposed in landing, probably in a crippled state, certainly not in a very efficient one.—Peniche fortress was in possession of the enemy. Mondego bay was therefore agreed on as most eligible to land at. Thinking it most important to drive the French from Portugal, he ordered general Spencer to embark (with his 5,000 men), and join off that coast. By his information of the 24th June, the French had more than 20,000 men in Portugal. The admiral's account made them less. Sir Arthur Wellesley thought they had not less than from 16 to 18,000.—It appears, that sir Arthur Wellesley quitted the admirals off the Tagus, on the 27th, and joined the transports off Mondego, on the 30th. He there received information from government (dated 15th July), that a reinforcement of brigadier general Ackland and five thousand men was intended for him, and eventually ten thousand more men, under lieutenant general sir John Moore: That sir Hew Dalrymple was to command the army: That sir Arthur Wellesley was also to proceed on the instructions he had received, viz. the attack of Lisbon, if his force was sufficient. Dupont having surrendered, general Spencer's arrival was now considered as certain, and also that of general Ackland very soon: The insurrection in Alentejo was a fortunate occurrence at this time, and sir Arthur Wellesley also received information from the secretary of state, dated 15th July, that sir Hew Dalrymple was appointed to the command of the forces in Spain and Portugal, and sir Harry Burrard second in command; and if, in the meantime, he was joined by any officer, senior in rank, he (sir Arthur Wellesley) was to serve under him. Of the same date, sir Harry Burrard was also acquainted by the secretary of state that operations are intended to be directed, in the first instance, to the reduction of the Tagus, and secondly, to the security of Cadiz, and destruction of the enemy's force in Andalusia.—It appears, that sir Arthur Wellesley was induced, from various strong reasons, as stated in his narrative, to disembark in Mondego bay. This commenced on the 1st of August; but the surf occasioned great difficulties, so that his corps was not all landed before the 5th. General Spencer arrived on the 5th, and his corps on the 6th. They landed on the 7th and 8th.—It appears, that from the 1st August till the 8th, when the whole was disembarked, that measures were taking for the immediate movement of the army towards Lisbon, and horses and carriages were solicited. Sir Ar-

thur Wellesley armed the Portuguese troops, offered money to assist in equipping them for the field, which was declined by their general officers, whom he met on the 7th, and arranged a plan of operations and march, which was delayed, at their desire, and for their convenience, till the 10th. He also left full information of his situation, intentions, and other circumstances, for lieut.-general sir Harry Burrard, on his arrival at Mondego (and for whom he had previously left advices at the Berlings, off Peniche, in case of his making that point), and recommended a plan of operations for sir John Moore's corps on its arrival, to act towards Santarem and the Tagus. On the 8th, he renewed his communications to sir Harry Burrard, leaving them at Mordego.—It appears, from the many substantial reasons enumerated in sir Arthur Wellesley's narrative, and with the aid of 6000 Portuguese, from whose co-operation he had reason to expect great advantage, but in which he was subsequently disappointed, that he determined to proceed (without waiting for his expected reinforcements, of which he had been apprised) with his own army, of 13,000 men (British) against an enemy who, he knew, could not well produce a greater number in the field. He advanced by the coast road towards Lisbon, for the substantial reason, among others, of preserving his communication with the shipping, from which alone he could derive his bread. Wine could be found in all the villages occupied by the army, and slaughter cattle were furnished by contractors.—It appears, that the army marched on the 9th and 10th of August, from Mondego, having horses; although indifferent, for 18 pieces of cannon, for ammunition great and small, a considerable store of bread, and a moderate hospital establishment. The cavalry, about 400, including 200 Portuguese.—On the 10th and 11th, they arrived at Leyria.—On the 13th, marched to Calveria.—On the 14th, to Alcabaca, where they received bread and oats, landed at Nazareth.—On the 15th, to Caldas, and halted the 16th, receiving further supplies from Nazareth.—It appears, that hitherto the Portuguese had moved on his left, extending towards the Tagus, but they now raised such difficulties about subsistence, and proceeding on the maine sir Arthur Wellesley thought most advisable, that he dispensed with their co-operation, on condition they would send him 1600 men, to be at his disposal, and to whom he was to furnish bread. He also recommended to their general, as a measure of safety, to remain about Caldas, which

they did till after the battle of Vimeira.—On the 17th, there was a very considerable action near Obidos, with a corps of 6000 men, under general Laborde, who had taken post in the defiles, and was forced to retire with considerable loss. This and a small previous action cost us about 480 men. The army was that night at Valla Verde, and on the morning of the 18th, heard of the arrival of general Anstruther's brigade on the coast.—On the 18th, the army marched to Lowinha, and on the 19th to Vimeira, where it halted on the 20th.—This day brigadier-general Anstruther's brigade (2400 men) joined, and lieutenant general sir H. Burrard arrived off Maciera in the afternoon.—On the 21st, early in the morning, brigadier-general Ackland's brigade (1750 men) landed and joined the army.—It appears, that when sir A. Wellesley was at Leyria, the enemy had the two considerable advanced corps of Laborde and Loison in their front, which (as he moved on with a Portuguese corps on his left, as far as Alcabaca) fell back towards Lisbon, and joined Junot, who had assembled by the 20th, from 12 to 14,000 men, at Torres Vedras, about eight miles from Vimeira; calculating probably, that the weather might disappoint the landing of Anstruther's and Ackland's brigades, whom he must have espied in the offing on the 19th and 20th. He determined to attack sir Arthur Wellesley's army in its situation at Vimeira, on the 21st, before the junction of so considerable a force. In this enterprise general Junot completely failed. His attack was repelled in the most gallant manner, and with great loss he was obliged to retreat upon Torres Vedras, and Cabeca de Monte Chique, where he endeavoured to re-assemble his troops. The detail of this honourable action, in which we lost 700 men, is given in the Extraordinary Gazette of Sept. 16, published upon this occasion.—It appears that lieutenant-general sir H. Burrard, having on the 21st of July received notice of your majesty's appointment of him as second in command of the forces placed under the command of lieutenant-general sir Hew Dalrymple, and having also received all necessary instructions, went immediately to Portsmouth, embarked on the 27th, and sailed on the 31st, in the Audacious, together with the fleet of transports, containing a corps of 10,000 infantry, commanded by lieut.-gen. sir J. Moore.—After a continuance of contrary wind and bad weather, the fleet was near Cape Finisterre on the 16th of August; and it having been recommended to him, that before he proceeded to the southward of Oporto, he

should himself go there or send another person to collect information, and meet the fleet at sea, he shifted, with several officers of his staff, to the Brazen sloop, and arriving at Oporto on the 17th, learnt that sir A. Wellesley had landed at Mondego, and proceeded along the coast-road to the southward. —On the 18th, he arrived off Mondego, and there found dispatches from sir A. Wellesley, recommending that sir J. Moore's corps should land at Mondego, and march upon Santarem, to confine the movements of the enemy on that side; and also stating that the army must depend on the transports for bread, and that reliance could not be placed on the resources of the country.—The difficulty of equipping and supplying sir J. Moore's corps for an interior operation at a distance from the rest of the army, and thinking that if thus acting separately, towards Santarem, he must have been inferior to the enemy if they chose to push that way; and on inquiry, not having been able to hear of 150 mules promised by the bishop of Oporto, sir H. Burrard was induced for the present to decline the proposed operation.—sir H. Burrard proceeded in the Brazen to the southward, and in the evening of the 19th received information of the action of the 17th, near Obidos. He immediately sent back lieut.-col. Donkin to meet sir J. Moore, and directed him to land in the Mondego Bay; and under a knowledge of sir A. Wellesley's former dispatches (which he transmitted) to act as he thought most beneficial to the service in his support. He also sent off lieut.-col. Carey to land at St Martines, and to communicate with sir A. Wellesley.—It appears, that sir J. Moore did arrive at Mondego on the 20th—that he began to disembark—that on the 22d he received an order from sir H. Burrard, to re-embark such as he had landed, and proceeded to Maciera—that he arrived on the 24th at Maciera Bay, and that he disembarked his corps on the days from the 25th to the 29th, the several divisions joining the army as they landed.—It appears, that on the evening of the 20th of August, when sir Harry Burrard arrived off the landing place of Maciera, he was going to land, when sir A. Wellesley came on board, gave an account of the general state of things, and ended by saying, that he had intended to march the next morning, by five o'clock, by the Mata road, the enemy having assembled his forces at Torres Vedras.—On detailing the many difficulties to be encountered, such as the impossibility of leaving his victuallers and the shore, for any considerable distance, the inferior number of his

cavalry, and the state of his artillery and carriage horses and mules, the strength of the ground he had to go over, which presented many difficulties, and the very little dependence which could be placed on the Portuguese assistance, sir Harry Burrard, on due consideration of all circumstances, decided, that it was more advantageous to wait for sir J. Moore's reinforcement, than to run any risk of defeating the great object, or of sacrificing a great many men without its complete accomplishment. [In this determination, sir Harry Burrard states, he was confirmed, by the opinions of brigadier-general Clinton and colonel Murray, his adjutant and quarter-master-generals.] He therefore gave orders to sir A. Wellesley accordingly, that the army was not to proceed on the morning of the 21st, and, more especially, as the landing and junction of general Ackland's brigade, on the night of the 20th, was yet unaccomplished and necessarily uncertain.—It appears, that sir A. Wellesley returned to Vimeira, and sir H. Burrard remained on board ship the night of the 20th, to complete his necessary dispatches by the return of the Brazen sloop.—During the night of the 20th, and the morning of the 21st, our patroles gave intelligence of the movements of the enemy; but being inferior in cavalry, they could go to no distance, and their reports were vague. As sir A. Wellesley thought it probable, if he did not attack the enemy, that they would attack him, he prepared to receive them at day-light in the morning, by posting the nine-pounders and strengthening his centre, where he expected the attack, from the manner of the enemy's patrolling.—The enemy first appeared in force on our left, about eight in the morning, and it was soon obvious that their attack would be made on our left, and on our advanced guard before Vimeira; the position of the greater part of the army was immediately changed by an extension to the left. The action commenced, and was concluded in the manner detailed in the Extraordinary Gazette, and terminated in a victory honourable and glorious to the British arms.—It appears that sir Harry Burrard had no information from, or communication with, sir Arthur Wellesley during the night of the 20th; but on the morning of the 21st, about nine o'clock, just as he was approaching the shore, he met an officer, sent by sir Arthur Wellesley, with information, that large bodies of the enemy had been seen moving towards our left.—Sir Harry Burrard proceeded towards Vimeira, with as much expedition as an indifferent horse would allow, on a hilly

road; being two miles and a half from the landing place. He arrived there before ten, at a time that the advanced corps (Anstruther's and Fane's brigades) were vigorously attacked. The officers conducting sir H. Burrard passed through the village, and brought him to sir Arthur Wellesley, on the heights behind the villages, where the left of the army had been originally posted. Here he was informed, saw, and approved of the steps taken by sir Arthur Wellesley to repulse the enemy, and directed him to proceed in the execution of an operation he had so happily and so well begun.—By this time it was evident that the attack upon the village and advanced corps was not meant to be further supported; it was completely repulsed, and the enemy retired in considerable confusion. They were not followed by the infantry, as the troops had received orders not to quit their position, without particular orders from sir Arthur Wellesley. The detachment of the 20th light dragoons alone pursued, but falling in with a superior cavalry, were soon obliged to return with considerable loss. This order had been very properly given, on a consideration that the principal effort of the enemy would still be made on our left, and upon this point the enemy had just opened his cannonade, and the brigade under major-general Ferguson was already engaged at distant musketry. As support arrived, he advanced, and the enemy gave way, abandoning three pieces of cannon. Major-general Ferguson still advanced, and a mile from where the first battery was taken, another also was taken. The enemy finally made an attempt to regain their last battery, but were repulsed by the 71st and 82d regiments and obliged to retire with great loss.—Soon after twelve the firing had ceased, and the enemy's cavalry were seen from our left, in bodies of about 200, by general Ferguson; and about the same time general Spencer saw a line formed, about three miles in front of our centre.—About half-past twelve, sir Arthur Wellesley proposed to sir Harry Burrard to advance from his right, with three brigades upon Torres Vedras, and with the other five brigades to follow the enemy, who had been defeated by our left.—It appears that the situation of the army at this moment was—on the right, major-general Hill's brigade, which had not been engaged, was on the height behind Vimeira, and at a distance of above three miles from those of generals Ferguson and Nightingale on the left. In front of Vimeira, and in the centre were the brigades of Anstruther and Fane, which had been warmly engaged. Brigadier-

generals Bowes's and Ackland's brigades were advanced on the heights, towards the left, in support of generals Ferguson and Nightingale. Brigadier-general Craufurd's brigade was detached rather to the rear of the left, about half a mile from major-gen. Ferguson, to support the Portuguese troops, making front in that direction.—It appears, that although the enemy was completely repulsed, the degree of expedition with which a pursuit could be commenced, considering the extended position of the army at that time, and the precaution to be taken against the superior cavalry of the enemy, must have depended on various local circumstances only to be calculated by those upon the spot.—This very circumstance of a superior cavalry retarding our advance, would allow the enemy's infantry, without any degree of risk, to continue their retreat in the most rapid manner, till they should arrive at any given and advantageous point of rallying and formation; nor did sir A. Wellesley, on the 17th of August, when the enemy had not half the cavalry as on the 21st, pursue a more inconsiderable and beaten army with any marked advantage; for he says (*Gazette Extraordinary*)—"The enemy retired with the utmost regularity, and the greatest celerity; and, notwithstanding the rapid advance of the British infantry, the want of a sufficient body of cavalry was the cause of his suffering but little loss in the plain:"—and again, "He succeeded in effecting his retreat in good order, owing principally to my want of cavalry."—It may also be considered, that as the attack on our centre had been repulsed long before that on our left had, the attacking corps, which, as has been observed, was not pursued (but by the 20th dragoons, not exceeding 150), had time (above an hour) to re-assemble, and to occupy such ground as might afterwards facilitate the retreat of their right, and that the enemy were actually and visibly formed in one or more lines at about three miles in front of the centre.—From these and other fair military grounds, as allowed by sir A. Wellesley; from those that occurred in sir H. Burrard's first interview with sir A. Wellesley; from the utmost certainty of the immediate arrival of sir J. Moore's corps, which, if they had not stopped at Mondego bay, would have been at Ma-ceira on the 21st; sir H. Burrard declined making any further pursuit that day, or ordering the army to march next morning early.—[In this opinion sir H. Burrard states brigadier-general Clinton and col. Murray concurred.]—On the 22d, sir H. Dalrymple

arrived and assumed the command of the army.—It appears that lieut.-general sir H. Dalrymple having, on the 7th of August, received your majesty's commands of the 15th July, to take the command of the forces to be employed in Portugal and Spain, and that lieut.-general sir H. Burrard was to be second in command, he sailed with the first fair wind from Gibraltar on the 13th of August, communicated with Lord Collingwood off Cadiz, and on the 19th with admiral sir C. Cotton off the Tagus, from whom he received information of the army under sir A. Wellesley, then landed in Portugal, and also that brigadier-general Ackland, with his brigade, was on the coast, looking for an opportunity of joining him. Sir H. Dalrymple sailing along the coast with an intention of making Mondego bay, heard of the action of the 21st; and that sir H. Burrard was arrived; this determined him to make for Maceira bay, where transports were at anchor. He landed in Maceira bay early in the forenoon of the 22d, proceeded to Vimiera, about two miles and a quarter distant, and after a short conversation with his two predecessors in command, whose instructions were those by which he was to act, he ordered the army to march early in the morning of the 23d, undoubtedly as soon as it could be put in motion after his arrival. It appears that in this situation of things the French general Kellerman arrived about noon of the 22d at Vimeira, with proposals for a suspension of arms, in order to settle a definitive convention for the evacuation of Portugal by the French army. Lieutenant-generals sir Harry Burrard and sir Arthur Wellesley assisted the commander of the forces in the discussions that took place on this subject, and it appearing to them, under all circumstances, as commanding a force acting in alliance with the sovereign of Portugal, and combatting in their country (from whence we then derived no material assistance), against an enemy in actual possession of their capital, their fortresses, and, in a military point of view, of their kingdom, that a convention, or capitulation, if the opportunity offered, which should speedily and honourably expel the French army from Portugal, was expedient and advisable, a cessation of arms was agreed upon, to terminate at 48 hours notice. The leading articles of a convention were also settled, and general Kellerman returned towards Lisbon, about nine at night, with the instrument stated in the extra Gazette of the 16th of Sept. but not to be considered as effectual without the concurrence of admiral sir C. Cotton.—Early

on the 23d, in the morning, lieut.-col. Murray, quarter-master-general, set out with the proposed agreement, to procure the concurrence of the admiral, and returned in the night of the 24th, with sir Charles Cotton's answer, that he could not accede, but that he would enter into treaty with the Russian admirals.—It appears that sir Charles Cotton having declined to sanction the Russian article, the commander of the forces conceived the armistice to end, and determined on sending lieutenant-colonel Murray to announce the recommencement of hostilities, at the end of forty-eight hours, in order, if general Junot chose it, that we might treat on the remaining articles as a basis.—This officer had powers to treat without delay. He had the commander of the forces' letter of the 25th, and certain memoranda of sir Arthur Wellesley, as laid before the board, which shewed the exact footing on which he was to act, as also general Kellerman's sentiments on the Russian question. Early on the 27th, communication was had from general Junot and lieutenant-colonel Murray, that a treaty was in agitation which was answered.—It appears that when the proposed treaty (ratified by general Junot) of the 28th of August, was brought by capt. Dalrymple on the 29th to head-quarters Ramalhal, all the lieutenant-generals (Burrard, Moore, Hope, Fraser, Wellesley) were present, lord Paget excepted (because not long previously summoned.) The proposed treaty was, however, formally discussed. Minutes of proposed alterations were taken by sir A. Wellesley, as laid before the board, and the commander of the forces has no reason to believe that sir J. Moore, or any of the lieutenant-generals that came with him, expressed any disapprobation of the state and terms of the negociation.—The treaty with the alterations proposed were re-transmitted to lieut.-col. Murray.—It appears when the treaty concluded by lieut.-col. Murray on the 30th, was brought by him to Torres Vedras on the 31st for ratification, the lieutenant-generals present were convened, and sir A. Wellesley was sent for. Lord Paget, who was at a distance, did not come, nor did sir A. Wellesley, his corps having marched that morning. The other lieutenant-generals met (Burrard, Moore, Fraser, Hope), the alterations made by lieut.-col. Murray were approved, and the treaty then ratified by the commander of the forces (sir H. Dalrymple) with the approbation of the lieutenant-generals present.—Some of the articles of the treaty of the 28th, before objected to by the lieutenant-

generals were altered in that of the 30th, and some other good alterations had been inserted, not before suggested. A comparison of the treaty of the 28th, and that ratified, will shew the alterations.—The meetings of the lieutenant-generals, the commander of the forces did not call, or consider as regular councils of war. He sought to benefit from their talents and experience, by consulting them on exigent cases, and by pursuing the measure he might himself deem most for the good of your majesty's service, after availing himself of the advantage he might draw from their reasonings, and he does not recollect there was any dissentient opinion on the 31st, as to the ratification of the convention.—It appears that sir J. Moore's corps having arrived at Mondego Bay on the 20th of Aug. began to disembark; that they re-embarked, and arrived off Maciera Bay on the 24th; that from the 25th to the 29th they landed under considerable difficulties, and successively joined the army at Torres Vedras.—It appears that some of the principal advantages to arise from the convention were in the contemplation of the generals.—That it immediately liberated the kingdom of Portugal from the dominion of the French, thereby restoring to the inhabitants their capital and fortresses, their principal sea-ports, their personal liberty, property, religion, and established government.—That it relieved a great extent of Spanish frontier from all apprehensions of an enemy, and the whole of Spain from that of having an enemy behind them, and allowed all parts of Spain to take more effective measures for its general defence; as well as permitted Portugal immediately to contribute for their mutual support.—That it enabled the British army immediately to enter Spain, if required, by central routes, while it transported the French force to a very distant part of their own coast, far removed from the Spanish frontier.—That it immediately released 4,000 Spanish soldiers, and sent them to the defence of Catalonia; it also released from the Portuguese frontier another body of 2,000 Spanish troops. The Portuguese army also became disposable for the common cause.—To the men of war and transports, which, at this season of the year, with great difficulty could keep their station near the coast, and on whose presence the supplies and operations of the army depended, the opening of the Tagus afforded immediate shelter.—It is further urged by the generals, as much more than probable, that if the enemy had been required to lay down their arms, and sur-

render prisoners of war, they would not have complied; but, if driven to extremity, they would have retired upon Lisbon, reinforced by 6000 Russians, who must have been thus compelled to share their fate; and in the temporary attack of this city, much calamity and destruction must have ensued.—Also, that masters of the Russian fleet, and of the boats and shipping in the Tagus, the passage of the river was ensured to them; that they could have defended, for a considerable time its east bank, and prevented the occupation of the Tagus by our fleet: that, with the strong fortresses of Alentejo in their possession, they could have protracted a destructive war, to the great detriment of Portugal and the Spanish cause, by finding employment for the greater part of the British army, for the remainder of the year, and whose difficulties and losses in such operations must have been very considerable.—It appears, that the forts on the Tagus were taken possession of on the 2d of September, by the British troops, and the port was then opened to our shipping: that on the 5th the army had its right at St. Juliens, and its left on the heights of Bellas: that on the 8th or 9th a British corps marched into Lisbon, to ensure the tranquillity of that city, during the embarkation of the enemy, who were all sent off (except the last division, purposely detained) before the end of the month, and part of the British army was then actually on its route towards the Spanish frontier.—It appears that, during the discussion, and afterwards during the execution of the Convention, much firmness was shewn in resisting the pretensions and interpretations of the enemy; every stipulation being restricted to its fair, honourable, and grammatical meaning, and the French not allowed to carry off, but obliged to disgorge plunder, which they affected to consider as private property.—It appears that pains were taken to misrepresent and raise a clamour in Portugal against this convention; but, when it was generally known, and its effects felt, the people of Lisbon, and of the country, seem to have expressed their gratitude and thanks for the benefits attending it.—It has been urged by sir Hew Dalrymple, and allowed by major-general Spencer, that in Egypt, in 1801 (after the victory of the 21st of March, the French having thrown their whole force into Alexandria and Grand Cairo, about 10,000 men in each place), that at the siege of Alexandria, in August, the country was in the full possession of the British and Turks. The garrison, cut off

from every possibility of relief, and could only have held out some days, when a capitulation was granted to it, September the 2d, as favourable as the Convention of Cintra to the army of Junot (of 24,000 French, and 6000 Russians), and perfectly similar in all the chief articles of men, baggage, artillery, conveyance, &c.; also, that the same terms had been previously granted to the garrison of Cairo, under much the same circumstances. By these two conventions, or capitulations, about 20,000 French evacuated Egypt, and the British army was left disposable for other purposes. On the whole it appears, that the operations of the army under sir Arthur Wellesley, from his landing in Mondego Bay the 1st of August, until the conclusion of the action at Vimiera, the 21st of August, were highly honourable and successful, and such as might be expected from a distinguished general, at the head of a British army of 13,000 men, augmented on the 20th and 21st to 17,000, deriving only some small aid from a Portuguese corps (1600 men), and against whom an enemy, not exceeding 14,000 men in the field, was opposed; and this before the arrival of a very considerable reinforcement from England, under lieut.-general sir John Moore, which, however, did arrive and join the army, from the 25th to the 30th of August.—It appears a point on which no evidence adduced can enable the board to pronounce, with confidence, whether or not a pursuit after the battle of the 21st, could have been efficacious; nor can the board feel confident to determine on the expediency of a forward movement to Torres Vedras, when sir Harry Burrard has stated weighty considerations against such a measure. Further, it is to be observed, that so many collateral circumstances could not be known in the moment of the enemy's repulse, as afterwards became clear to the army, and have been represented to the board. And considering the extraordinary circumstances under which two new commanding generals arrived from the ocean, and joined the army (the one during, and the other immediately after, a battle, and those successively superseding each other, and both the original commander within the space of 24 hours), it is not surprising that the army was not carried forward, until the second day after the action, from the necessity of the generals being acquainted with the actual state of things, and of their army, and proceeding accordingly.—It appears that the Convention of Cintra in all its progress and conclu-

sion, or at least all the principal articles of it, were not objected to by the five distinguished lieutenant-generals of that army; and other general officers who were on that service, whom we have had an opportunity to examine, have also concurred in the great advantages that were immediately gained, to the country of Portugal, to the army and navy, and to the general service, by the conclusion of the Convention at that time.

—On a consideration of all circumstances, as set forth in this Report, we most humbly submit our opinion, that no further military proceeding is necessary on the subject. Because, howsoever some of us may differ in our sentiments respecting the fitness of the convention in the relative situation of the two armies, it is our unanimous declaration, that unquestionable zeal and firmness appear throughout to have been exhibited by lieut.-general sir Hew Dalrymple, sir Harry Burrard, and sir Arthur Wellesley, as well as that the ardour and gallantry of the rest of the officers and soldiers, on every occasion during this expedition, have done honour to the troops, and reflected lustre on your majesty's arms.

—All which is most dutifully submitted.—(Signed) DAVID DUNDAS, general.—MOIRA, general.—PETER CRAIG, general.—HEATHFIELD, general.—PEMBROKE, lieut.-gen.—G. NUGENT, lieut.-gen.—OL. NICOLLS, lieut.-gen.

*Judge Advocate General's Office, Dec. 27, 1808.*—In consequence of the following letter from his royal highness the commander-in-chief to general sir David Dundas, as president, viz.

*Horse Guards, Dec. 25, 1808.*

Sir, The judge advocate general having delivered to me to be laid before his majesty, the several papers and documents, containing all the examinations and proceedings taken before the Board of Inquiry, of which you are the president, together with your report and opinion upon the whole of the late operations of his majesty's forces in Portugal, as connected with the armistice and subsequent convention of Cintra, I think it incumbent on me to state to you, that although the Report is fully detailed, and perfectly explanatory of all the transactions as they appeared in evidence before you; yet upon a due consideration of the whole matter, it certainly appears that your opinion upon the conditions of the armistice and convention, which the words of his majesty's warrant expressly enjoin should be strictly examined, inquired into, and reported upon, has been altogether omitted.—I feel it my duty, therefore, to call your attention to these two

principal features of this important case, the armistice and convention, and to desire that you may be pleased to take the same again into your most serious consideration, and subjoin to the opinion which you have already given upon the other points submitted to your examination and inquiry, whether, under all the circumstances which appear in evidence before you, on the relative situation of the two armies, on the 22d of August, 1808, it is your opinion that an armistice was advisable, and if so, whether the terms of that armistice were such as ought to have been agreed upon; and whether, upon a like consideration of the relative situation of the two armies subsequent to the armistice, and when all the British forces were landed, it is your opinion that a Convention was advisable, and if so, whether the terms of that convention were such as ought to have been agreed upon.—I am the more desirous that you should resume the consideration of these two points, the armistice and convention, as it appears upon the face of your Report, that a difference of opinion exists among the members of the board, which may probably produce a dissent from the majority upon these very questions. You will be pleased, therefore, to desire such of the members as may be of a different opinion from the majority upon these two questions, to record upon the face of the proceedings their reasons for such dissent.—I am, Sir, yours, (Signed) FREDERICK, commander-in-chief.—*Gen. Sir D. Dundas, K. B.*

The board met this day at the judge-advocate general's office, when the said letter having been read, they agreed that the following questions should be put to each of the members of the board.

Do you, or do you not, approve of the armistice as concluded on the 22d of August, 1808, in the relative situation of the two armies?

*Approve.*—Lt.-gen. Nicolls; Lt.-gen. sir G. Nugent; earl of Pembroke; lord Heathfield; general Craig; gen. sir D. Dundas.

*Disapprove.*—Earl of Moira.

Do you, or do you not, approve of the convention as concluded upon the 31st of August, 1808, in the relative situation of the two armies?

*Approve.*—Lt.-gen. sir G. Nugent; gen. lord Heathfield; general Craig; gen. sir D. Dundas.

*Disapprove.*—Lt.-gen. Nicolls; earl of Pembroke; earl of Moira.

(Signed) DAVID DUNDAS, President.

My reason for considering the armistice as advisable on the 22d of August was, because the enemy had been able to retire after

the battle of the 21st, and take up a strong defensive position.—OL. NICOLLS, L. G.

I think, considering the great increase of our force, from the first suspension of hostility to the definitive signing of the convention, added to the defeat the enemy had suffered, sir Hew Dalrymple was fully entitled to have insisted upon more favourable terms.—OL. NICOLLS, L. G.

I approve of the armistice after a due consideration of the relative situations of the two armies on the evening of the 22d of August, but I cannot fully approve of the whole of the convention, after a due consideration of the relative situation of the two armies at that time; because it does not appear to me that, in the progress of the negociation, sufficient stress was laid upon the great advantages which had resulted, or were likely to result, from the former successful operations of the British army in the field, from the considerable reinforcements which had joined it, subsequent to the commencement of the negociation, from the cause in which the British army was engaged being the cause of Portugal, which gave good reason to reckon upon the goodwill, if not upon the active assistance, of the majority of the inhabitants; and, also, from the unusual readiness which, as it appears to me, was manifested by general Junot to enter into negociation, and by the French negotiator to accede to terms as they were proposed, and to such construction as lieutenant-general sir Hew Dalrymple put upon them in some instances, where they might have borne a difference of interpretation. I therefore think it probable, for the above reasons, that if less favourable terms to the French army had been insisted upon, they would have been acceded to.—PEMBROKE, lieut.-gen.

I feel less awkwardness in obeying the order to detail my sentiments on the nature of the convention, because that I have already joined in the tribute of applause due in other respects to the officers concerned. My opinion, therefore, is only opposed to theirs on a question of judgment, where their talents are likely to have so much more weight, as to render the profession of my difference, even on that point, somewhat painful. The duty is, however, imperious on me not to disguise or qualify the deductions which I have made during this investigation.—An armistice simply might not have been objectionable, because sir Hew Dalrymple, expecting hourly the arrival of sir John Moore's division, might see more advantage for himself in a short suspension of hostilities, than what the French could

draw from it. But as the armistice involved, and in fact established the whole principle of the convention, I cannot separate it from the latter.—Sir A. Wellesley has stated, that he considered his force, at the commencement of the march from the Mondego River, as sufficient to drive the French from their positions on the Tagus. That force is subsequently joined by above 4000 British troops, under generals Anstruther and Ackland. The French make an attack with their whole disposable strength, and are repulsed with heavy loss, though but a part of the British army is brought into action. It is difficult to conceive that the prospects which Sir A. Wellesley entertained could be unfavourably altered by these events, even had not the certainty of speedy reinforcements to the British army existed.—It is urged, that had the French been pushed to extremity, they would have crossed the Tagus, and have protracted the campaign in such a manner as to have frustrated the more important view of the British generals—namely, sending succours into Spain.

This measure must have been equally feasible for the French, if no victory had been obtained over them; but I confess that the chance of such an attempt seems to me assumed against probability. Sir Hew Dalrymple notices what he calls “the critical and embarrassed state of Junot,” before that general has been pressed by the British army; and, in explanation of that expression, observes, that the surrender of Dupont, the existence of the victorious Spanish army in Andalusia, which cut off the retreat of the French in that direction, and the universal hostility of the Portuguese, made the situation of Junot one of great distress. No temptation for the translation of the war into Alentejo presents itself from this picture—nor does any other representation give ground to suppose that Junot could have contemplated the measure as holding forth any prospect but ultimate ruin, after much preliminary distress and disgrace. The strongest of all proofs as to Junot’s opinion, arises from his sending, the very morning after the battle of Vimiera, to propose the evacuation of Portugal; a step which sufficiently indicated that he was satisfied he could not only make no effectual defence, but could not even prolong the contest to take the chance of accidents. He seems, indeed, to have been without any real resource.—It appears in evidence, that of the troops left by him in Lisbon and the forts,

a considerable proportion were of very doubtful quality. Those troops on whose fidelity he could confide, had been dismayed by a signal defeat, and they were sensible that they had no succour to look to from abroad. To the British generals it was known, when the armistice was granted, that 10,000 men under Sir J. Moore, as well as the 3d and 42d regiments of foot, with the 18th dragoons, might be immediately reckoned upon; and although much advantage had not been drawn from the Portuguese troops, their support and the general violence of the country against the French, cannot be laid out of this calculation.—The disparity of force and of circumstances was, then, such as could leave no doubt that the issue must be favourable to us. I do not omit advertence to the difficulties urged as possible to occur in furnishing the British army with bread. But, putting aside the obvious solution, that such a temporary privation is not ruinous to an army where cattle can be procured in the country, this difficulty cannot be well pleaded, if admission is to be given to the speculation, that the heavy cannon necessary for battering forts St. Julien and Cascaes were to be got ashore in the bays of the Rock of Lisbon. The question then comes to this, whether the convention did (as has been asserted) secure all the objects which were proposed in the expedition. If it did not, it was not what his majesty was entitled to expect from the relative situation of the two armies.—I humbly conceive it to have been erroneous to regard the emancipation of Portugal from the French, as the sole or the principal object of the expedition.—Upon whatever territory we contend with the French, it must be a prominent object in the struggle to destroy their resources, and to narrow their means of injuring us, or those whose cause we are supporting. This seems to have been so little considered in the convention, that the terms appear to have extricated Junot’s army from a situation of infinite distress, in which it was wholly out of play, and to have brought it in a state of entire equipment, into immediate currency, in a quarter too, where it must interfere with our most urgent and interesting concerns.—Had it been impracticable to reduce the French army to lay down its arms unconditionally, still an obligation not to serve for a specified time might have been insisted upon, or Belleisle might have been prescribed as the place at which they should be landed,

(To be continued.)

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 2.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JANUARY 14, 1809. [Price 10d.

"The foolishest of all hopes (to say nothing of the wickedness of it) is, that Napoleon will be beaten, and "that then, the Spaniards will quietly return to submission to their former government. There are, I "am afraid, people enough, who entertain such hopes; but, if they reflect for one moment, they must "be convinced, that it can never be accomplished; for, to resist Buonaparté will require, such language, "such sentiments, such active measures as to rank and property, as well as to warlike preparations, as "will so completely annihilate the old government, that it can never be restored."—POL. REGISTER, Vol. XIV. page, 105.

33] SUMMARY OF POLITICS. [34]

MR. HERBERT.—This gentleman's address to the electors of Hampshire, a copy of which will be found immediately below\* contains matter worthy of the notice, not of the people of Hampshire only, but of the whole nation. For the purpose of saving time, I have numbered the paragraphs. The FIRST contains nothing of general interest. Not so the SECOND and THIRD, which may be looked upon, and evidently was intended as an answer to the pledge demanded by me, and which pledge will be found in the last volume of the Political Register at page 841.—It is something, at any rate, to hear a candidate declare, that he never will accept of a pension or sinecure, and this declaration Mr. Herbert has distinctly made, in a manner the most likely to be remembered. I, therefore, conclude, that he means, un-

der all possible circumstances, to adhere to this promise, and in that conclusion I have, I must confess, great pleasure. It is one step, at least, in the right path; and it is a step, which, with the sole exception of Lord Cochrane, no one, of late times, has, as far as I have observed, thought proper to take.—But, from *place* Mr. Herbert will not debar himself by any pledge. This he calls foregoing the prospects of *fair ambition*, and binding himself to *take no share* in the administration of public affairs.—The pledge, which I demanded, as the only terms, upon which I would give my vote, had no such object in view. As will be seen by reference to it, all that I wished to accomplish was this, that persons, once chosen to be the *guardians of the people's money*, never should, during their whole lives, pocket, either by themselves or their relations and depen-

\* MR. HERBERT's Address to the Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders of the County of Southampton, dated, Highclere, Dec. 21, 1808.

I.—I SHOULD have thought myself very deficient in respect to those, whom I once had the honour of calling my constituents, if upon a vacancy, when no candidate appeared in the field against me, I had not renewed the humble offer of my services. It is most pleasant to my feelings, that some, who were formerly hostile to my pretensions, should have spontaneously tendered their support; and I shall ever remember with gratitude and pride, that at a premature and surreptitious nomination, which the sheriff was persuaded to call without due notice, (though an active personal canvass had been undertaken by my opponent, with all the advantage of ministerial influence, though the greater part of my friends knew not of the meeting till the day was passed), the shew of hands in my favour should have been so numerous and respectable, that the sheriff

should have paused for a time, and not without hesitation have pronounced his judgment. I must express my thanks for the profound attention with which the whole meeting, with which both parties heard my refutation, of a most unjust and unfounded misrepresentation, of my conduct in parliament, and for the universal expression of approbation at the part I had acted on that occasion.—II. Called upon at that meeting to declare that I would accept no office or pension, I pledged myself to reject every offer of a pension or sinecure, and to exert myself in parliament to dry the sources of corruption; and I applauded the motives that prompted the request. But further urged to debar myself from the prospects of fair and honourable ambition, and bind myself, at no future period to take any share in the administration of public affairs, I felt it my duty, not to myself only, but to the body of electors, but to the nation at large, to refuse a pledge, which if universally extorted from candidates would

dents, any part of that money. I said nothing about prohibiting any one from becoming a minister, or filling any office, upon any future occasion; but, then, I clearly meant, that, supposing him to fill any office, he should do it *without pay*, which, in many cases, at least, a man qualified to be a member of parliament, may very well do.—But, I confess, that my wish would be, that men who are chosen members of parliament, should *never* become servants of the king. A man cannot serve two masters; and, it matters very little, whether he be nominally the servant of both at one and the same time; or whether he be the nominal servant of one of them, while he is paving his way for being taken into the service of the other.—But in his Third paragraph, Mr. Herbert lets us see, that he thinks it right, and even necessary for the public good, that members of parliament should, at the same time, be servants of the king; that they should, in one and the same hour, ask for money in the latter capacity, and vote it in the former. This opinion being so directly at variance with plain common sense, it is worth while to examine into the reasons, upon which it is founded. He says, that, if members were to lose the right of questioning the ministers face to face, the debates would become unimportant; that the censures of the House would be little worth, and passed with-

out a hearing; that evil counsellors, who must tremble at the awful moment when they are publicly called to account, would lull themselves in security, without the necessity and even without the means of justifying themselves to the nation; and, that the dread of meeting an able minority front to front, is, *in these days*, almost the only check upon the actions of ministers.—“*In these days*” is an important phrase; for, it is precisely because the “days” are what they are, that I wish for a *change*. Mr. Herbert’s doctrine is in direct opposition to the *Act of Settlement*, which declares persons holding places of profit under the Crown to be incapable of serving as members of parliament. This act, till base and corrupt ministers found it troublesome, remained in force, and no inconvenience was experienced from it. Nay, when the act, as far as related to this important point, was repealed, the repealers, though most profligate men, had not the impudence to do it without an appearance of *preserving the principle*; and, therefore, they enacted, that, if a member accepted of a place of emolument *after* his election, his seat should, in consequence thereof, be vacated, in order to give the people who elected him when he had no place, an opportunity of rejecting him on account of his having a place.—Now, will Mr. Herbert say, that the object of this law was, and is, really what it professes to

be subversive of the constitution, and fatal to the liberties of the country.—III. If the ministers of the crown are to be excluded from parliament; if members are to lose that which is the best privilege of the representatives of the people, the right of questioning those ministers face to face before the public assembly; their debates would be frivolous, uninteresting, and unimportant; their censures would be little worth, and passed without a hearing; the advisers of the king, who, if they have erred through guilt or incapacity, must tremble at the awful moment when they are called upon publicly to account for their misconduct, would lull themselves in silent security, without the necessity, without even the means of justifying themselves to the nation. The dread of meeting an able minority front to front in parliament, is *in these days* almost the only check upon the actions of ministers.—IV. With sentiments most hostile to the corruption that preys upon the vitals of the kingdom, most eager for satisfactory investigation of public misconduct, I offered myself to

your notice; but ministers cannot tolerate such freedom, and all the influence of government was armed against me, in favour of a gentleman not eligible to represent the county. With a majority, even under those circumstances, of independent electors in my favour, as the nomination on the 23rd appeared to witness, I was advised not to harass the county by the prolongation of a poll, which was deemed superfluous, when the only eligible opponent felt himself unable to cope with me, and declined the contest. I am grateful for the free and zealous friendship I have experienced, and that strong support which has deterred any eligible candidate from persevering at the poll. I trust that I shall be seated as your representative in parliament; and I hail the dawn of better days in this county, from the unsolicited assurances of support, in the present and any future contest, which I have received from freeholders connected with the dock-yard, who would not resign their mental independence, though harassed and persecuted by the agents of government.

be? Will he say, that the electors do really hereby obtain the opportunity stated above? I think, he will not; for it is impossible for him to produce me a single instance of a member of parliament having been prevented from again entering the walls of the House after having accepted of a place of profit under the Crown. It is notorious, that the vacating of the seat, upon such an occasion, is a mere matter of form. The Secretaries of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the rest of them, are appointed without any one entertaining the smallest doubt of their being again returned. Nay, when a change of ministry takes place, during a session of parliament, is it not notorious, that "the Opposition," as it is called, the regular body, upon the opposite benches, abstain from all warfare, till the enemies arrive; and do we not always hear it said, that such an one cannot come into the engagement till such a day, because, until that day his return cannot arrive? That this is the fact no one can deny. But, whether it be so, or not, Mr. Herbert is left in a dilemma, if he approve of the law as it now stands; for, suppose the people to obtain an opportunity of rejecting the member that becomes a place-man, and suppose them to reject him, of which the letter of the law implies the probability and even the propriety; suppose the electors of all the members, composing a new ministry, to reject them upon the score of place, and supposing there to be no good-natured, modest gentlemen, to give up their seats and their constituents to them; in that case, we should lose the amazing benefit, which Mr. Herbert perceives in the having of the ministers in the House; and, on the other hand, if this be *impossible*, or, if there be not the smallest chance of this, the law with respect to re-election is . . . . . ; and, those, who affect to see a security for the people in it, are . . . . what I need not describe, and what I will not describe in terms other than those, which they so richly deserve. I will not wrong my thoughts by the using of words, which would be an inadequate expression of them.—But, the *debates*, Mr. Herbert says, would become frivolous and unimportant, if the king's counsellors and servants were not in the House. The *debates*! All is debate. Why, there is a standing order of the House against publishing any debate; and, moreover, any member may, whenever he pleases, cause the galleries to be cleared, and the doors

to be locked against all spectators and hearers. It is, to be sure, a very valuable thing that we possess; a mighty thing for our liberties, that any one member, either of those for Old Sarum, without even a seconder, may, at any time, totally deprive us of.—But, Sir, *why* should the Debates become of no importance; of no interest at all to us, if the ministers and other placemen were kept out of the House? They might, indeed, be of little interest to those, who are now seeking for place through the means of debates; but, to the people: is it possible, that you can think, that the discussions of men, who were the real representatives of the people; who could scarcely have any views towards gain of any sort; who would be under no temptation to vote this way or that way to serve themselves, or to serve a party: is it possible, that you can think, that the discussions of such men would be less interesting to the people, than the wranglings of two parties, *always* opposed to each other, taking opposite positions in the House as naturally as two hostile armies, and well known to be contending for the places and emoluments which the Crown has to bestow? No, it is not possible; I assert, that it is not possible for you to believe, that the discussions of an assembly where, upon all great occasions, it is known before hand of which side each member will speak and vote; where it is known before hand what the result will be: I assert it to be impossible for you to believe, that the Debates of such an assembly, can be so interesting as the debates of an assembly, where there is no such foreknowledge, and where there is known to exist, generally speaking, nothing to bias the judgment of the members. You must have observed, Sir, the difference, which, in point of interest, is excited by the speeches of *Barristers* and that of the *Judge*. The cause of this is, not the superior ability of the Judge, for such is not always the case; not the novelty of the matter, for that has been already amply detailed; but solely the persuasion, that what is said by the Judge proceeds from an unbiased mind. And, Sir, for this same reason, the debates of an assembly, not divided into regular parties, would, in the same degree, excite an interest greater than that which is excited by the debates of the House of Commons, as that House is now filled.—As to the advantage of "questioning the ministers face to face," they were so questioned, when they were excluded from parliament. They were

sent to the House by the king, to bear his Messages ; to ask for Money in his name ; and to give such explanations, as the representatives of the people required at their hands. There is, surely, nothing difficult in this. It is the regular and natural course of proceeding ; but, can any one pretend, that it is natural ; can any one pretend, that it is not a monstrous absurdity, that ministers, that the servants of the king, or, indeed, that any body else in this world, should be *called to account by themselves* ; that they should sit in judgment, and vote, and assist in the deciding, upon the merits, or demerits, of their own conduct ; and especially when it is known beforehand, when it is acknowledged to be essential to the very system, that they have, and must have, a majority in their favour, it being, according to that system, impossible for them to hold their places any longer than they have that majority ?—“Tremble at the *awful* moment of meeting an able minority !” You surprize me, Sir. What have they, as long as they can preserve their majority, to tremble at ? When did you see a ministry tremble, except for the loss of their places ? And why should they ? But, if there were a House of Commons, without placemen or pensioners ; consisting of men not capable of being placed or pensioned ; if the race could not be for power and emolument ; if the members could not, in the future, discover any motive for indulgence, and lenity with respect to the past ; then, indeed, wicked or foolish counsellors would have good cause to “tremble at the awful moment of meeting,” not an “*able* minority,” but an *honest* majority, in parliament, who would not waste their time in making long *lawyer-like* speeches, in order to shew their fitness for conducting *wars* and *negotiations* ; but, who, having only their own good, as connected with that of the public, in view, would busy themselves in doing that which belonged to their office, as guardians of the public treasure and the public liberty.—If the House of Commons contained no placemen ; if it were unmixed with the servants of the king ; if it were composed of men who never could touch the public money, can it be believed, that the public money would not be better taken care of ? Besides the incompatibility of the two situations, in this respect, is it not evident, that a man, who has, for one half of the year, to fight daily battles in the House of Commons for the preservation of his place, must neglect the duties of that place ? Is

it not evident, that, if a man be compelled to give his mind up to debate and the preparation for debate, the duties of his office must be left to underlings, or be wholly neglected ? Nay, is it not evident, that, if the possession of the place is to depend upon Debates in the House of Commons, he will fashion his measures and especially his appointments and other favours to that mould which is likely to insure him the greatest number of friends in that House ; which fashioning would be useless for his purpose, were the members and the relations of the members incapable of receiving emoluments from the public purse ?—The king, too, would, if this were the case, be left free in his choice of servants. He would not be compelled to take into his council a whole pack together. He would not be compelled to consider who could make the best, or, rather, the longest, speeches, and who could carry with them the greatest number of votes. He would be free to select whomsoever he thought most able and most trust-worthy ; while the Commons, on their side, could have no reason for undue bias or partiality, in this respect, at the same time, that, if the king had counsellors, whom they disapproved of, they would, at all times, have the power of censuring them, of impeaching them, or of causing their removal by following the old constitutional course of *refusing money* ; which is now, all the world knows, a power that is never exercised, nor is it ever thought of being exercised.—Is there an evil we complain of, or feel, which cannot be traced to this source ? Let Mr. Herbert review all the circumstances, which led to, and which have followed, the Cintra Convention ; and, I am persuaded, that, whether in the appointments, the progress of the thing itself, or the proceedings consequent upon it, he will clearly discover the prime cause to be that very system of things, of which he professes himself to be an advocate. If the war-minister, or all the ministers together, had had no debatings and dividings to look to ; if they had had nobody but their master to obey ; no families or particular individuals to conciliate or gratify ; they would have acted upon the evidence of their senses ; and being men of common discernment at least, they could not have greatly erred. But, hampered, perplexed, divided in their feelings, as they constantly are, with duty on one side, and powerful importunity, not to say menace, on the other, is it any wonder that they so frequently yield to the latter, and that,

of that yielding, we have so frequently to suffer and to blush for the consequences?

—Such are the reasons, which induced me to propose the plége, at Winchester; and, with me, at least, these reasons will continue to operate, until I hear something more forcible opposed to them, than what I have yet met with in any writing, ancient or modern.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—Sir John Moore's dispatches, “*extracts*” from which were published in last *Tuesday's Gazette*, after having been kept close from *Sunday noon*, show most clearly, I think, that our army was in a perilous situation, at the close of the last month, and prepare us for hearing of a very calamitous result of the campaign. I have heard of a letter from the Marquis de la Romana to Sir John Moore, speaking of the *disposition of the people of Spain*; but, of *that letter* it would, I suppose, be unwise to give us a sight, until, at least, the course of our preparation is somewhat further advanced. The proclamations, however, of ROMANA and PALAFON do enable those amongst us, who attend a little to authentic documents, to form a pretty accurate judgment of that disposition, which, according to evidence now referred to, is far from being what it has been described by our ministers and our news-papers.—The “*loyal*,” indeed, are vomiting forth flames of furious abuse against those, who venture to express doubts as to the goodness of the disposition of the people of Spain; but, that abuse will not alter the fact; and, moreover, it may become difficult, by-and-by, to reconcile it with any defence of the movements of our army, and, what is more with these abusers, of the conduct of the ministers, whose sole ground of defence, if I am not very greatly deceived, must be, that the people of Spain were, after all, found not to be much disposed to resist Buonaparté. This will, after the manifold assertions made respecting the unanimous zeal of the Spaniards in the cause of their “beloved Ferdinand VII,” be a most humiliating confession; it will be a fearful confession to make to the people of England, Ireland, and Scotland; but, the ministers have a choice of evils: they must make this confession; and they must also confess that they have, in this respect, been grossly deceived; or, they must confess, that they have had so little skill and energy, that, with a whole nation of eleven millions on their side, and with the complete command of all the sea-coast of the country, they have been unable to obtain

for us or for Spain any thing but disappointment, loss, and disgrace, though they themselves had an army of two hundred thousand men, capable of being sent to Spain, with more than a sufficiency of ships to transport it thither, and safely to land it, at a time when a Frenchman dared not show his head upon the Peninsula.—Now, when our armies are retreating for their lives; when they are hard pressed for their very existence; when, according to the dispatch of Sir John Moore, they are daily and hourly harrassed in their rear, and when the enemy's swiftest troops almost surround them; now, forsooth, the impudent hireling writers dare bid us look for hope to the South. Just as if any resistance would be made to an army that will, in all probability, not have left a British soldier in the whole of Spain and Portugal. Just as if the spirit of the people of Spain would rise after that. But, there is no measure to the deception, the falsehoods, the lies, the frauds, that are practised upon this cullible nation.—“*Extracts*”? Why extracts? Why did you not give us the *whole* of Sir John Moore's dispatches? You were afraid of the *cost*, perchance? Careful of our money, ah? Useless, to waste it upon paper and print, when we want it for so many other purposes? Cry your mercy, my lord, I was not before aware of your economical turn. The whole must come at last. We must have it; and if you give it us not, Buonaparté, in his neighbourly malignity, certainly will give us something that will answer the same purpose.—Sentiments, resembling those expressed in my motto, have been repeated by me so often, since the resistance to Napoleon began, in Spain, that I am almost ashamed to repeat them; but if our worst enemies repeat their lies daily, I see no reason why I, may not weekly repeat truths. “Spain has been lost from the *dread of liberty*,” said a correspondent, the other day; and, really, I am much afraid, that this will prove but too true. What Napoleon has promised in his decrees, which will be found in another part of this sheet, the Junta should have promised before, and *why they did not*, will, perhaps, hereafter come to light. Are we told, that the people of Spain did not wish it? That they did not desire to see the Council of Castile, the Inquisition, and the Monks, put down? Besides the utter improbability, of this being, under any circumstances, true, we have the evidence, in the negative furnished by Napoleon's Decrees; for, we may be sure, and espe-

cially if we believe him to have made *false promises*, that those promises accord with the well-known wishes of the people, or, at least, of that part of the people, which it is of the greatest importance for him to have on his side. There is no denying this. The more we are convinced of his faithlessness ; the more we are convinced of the truth of the assertion, that he will stick at nothing to secure success, the more complete our conviction must be, that the prevailing wish of the people was, and is, that that should be done, which he has now promised to do. Our news-papers accuse him of baseness, in making promises, which he does not mean to fulfil ; but the question is, can they accuse him of making promises, which he does not think likely to insure his success in conquering Spain ? They must do this, and then no soul would be fool enough to believe a word they say ; or, they must admit that what he has promised, is consonant to the wishes of the people ; and, if they make this admission, they will have to answer the question : why did not *we and the Junta* make similar promises ?—A population of eleven millions, in a country like Spain, is not to be subdued by *arms*, if they have arms to defend themselves with, and hearts to use them ; but, a population of ten times as many millions, if indifferent to their fate, is, what Mr. Windham described it, an “unresisting medium.” If, therefore, we found, that promises, such as those now explicitly made by Napoleon, were necessary to rouse the people to arms, we should as the condition of our aid, have insisted upon the making of those promises ; or, we should never have attempted to send an army to Spain.—It appears to me, that the very best that can be said for our not having insisted upon this, is, that we were not rightly informed upon the subject ; that we were not duly apprised of the people’s wishes. This is, at all times, a poor defence for men intrusted with the affairs of a nation, and particularly for men, who, it is notorious, had all the means of correct information completely in their hands.—A fraud ! a fraud ! I see a new fraud approaching, and I beseech the reader’s attention to it without delay. While our troops were said to be advancing, they were, by all the newspapers, said to amount to 45,000 men, and those of Romana to 20,000 ; but, now, the retreat being sounded, ours are brought down to 35,000 men, and Romana’s army is sunk out of sight. This is a nice coun-

terpart to the sinking and raising of the numbers of the French in Portugal. And yet these same editors have the assurance to prefer the charge of falsehood against Napoleon’s bulletins ; and, what is worse, gravely to sermonize upon the *immorality* of such falsehoods !—About two weeks ago, we were in high glee, that Sir John Moore, joined by Romana, was about to envelope and capture, or cut to pieces, the corps of Soult, which was said to be unsupported ; but, now, we can most manfully revile Napoleon, because he has, “in such a cowardly manner,” drawn together his whole force to march against “our little army.”—Not a word do any of our intelligencers give us about the *Duc d’Abrantes*, who is, however, in Spain, with the *eight or ten*, and not the *twenty-seven*, thousand men, who ought to have been with him in England. Not a word about him. That is a sore point. But, in spite of all this disguise, his corps makes part of that army, before whom Sir John Moore is retreating to the coast ; to that very coast, whence we carried the *Duc d’Abrantes* to land him in France.—Seeing that we have Sir John Moore’s dispatches in so mutilated a state, it is hardly fair to judge of them ; but, it does really surprise one to hear him talk, as if *what he had done* ought to enable the Spaniards in the South to do something. Poor fellows ! they saw him approach near to a corps of the French army, and the moment the main army of the French began to move, they saw him retreat, pushing away as fast as possible towards the coast. What “profit” were they to derive from this ? It is a sad mockery ; but we have not the *whole* of the dispatch.—The public should be upon their guard against the accounts of the “brilliant affairs” of this or that detachment. I have no doubt that our *soldiers* are better than the French soldiers. They are cooler and stronger, and I verily believe more brave. But the words “fine fellow” and “gallant fellow,” bestowed upon two or three men of interest, in letters from the army, like those that gave us an account of Sir Arthur Wellesley’s Protest, will be no consolation to me, and, I think, will be no consolation to any rational man, for the waste of so much of our national means, and for the disgrace of being driven out of Spain, with an army of 45,000 Englishmen, without one single engagement with the enemy.

*LIBEL LAW.*—When I was in London, a few days ago, a Number of the “*Satyrist*” was put into my hands. This work was

mentioned, and a description of its authors was given, in pages 397 and 398 of the last volume of the Political Register. I then noticed their unjustifiable, their indecent and vile attack upon the wife and family of sir Richard Phillips, and said, that I had been told, that they were a nest of *turned-off*, half-starved authors. I now find, that I was very correctly informed ; but, in the Number, which I have last seen, there is something so very infamous, that I cannot forbear pointing it out for the reprobation of the public.—The editors inform their readers, that MR. FINNERTY is *under prosecution for a libel* by the Attorney General for having edited the pamphlet of Major Hogan. Then they proceed to state certain things against him, all calculated to render him an object of public hatred and scorn, and, of course, violently to prejudice against him those persons who may happen to be the jury upon the trial, than which, surely, nothing can well be more wicked. Not content with this, however, they assert, that he has fled from the country, thereby giving a hint to the Attorney General, if he were so disposed, to cause the gentleman accused to be arrested, and imprisoned until the trial. The bold and unqualified manner, in which this assertion was made, led me to fear that it was true ; but, upon inquiry, I found it to be false, and, since that inquiry was made, I have seen Mr. Finnerty, who was in town, I understand, all the while, and who was, as usual, engaged in his business, which is of a nature not to admit of his remaining within doors for any length of time. So that it is almost impossible, that the falsehood should not have been wilful, and uttered with the malignant view above described.

" Heav'n has no curse like love to hatred turn'd,  
" Nor Hell a fury like a woman scorn'd."

And, I hear, that there are some authoresses engaged in this work, who though never scorned by men, perhaps, have been scorned by the press, a lover whose rejection they do not less sensibly feel.—At any rate, whether proceeding from the pen of a scorned authoress, or from that of a scorned author, I think, it will be admitted, that nothing ever was more diabolical. So base an act, to endeavour to excite, by known falsehoods ; deliberately to sit down, and, by such means, excite a deep prejudice in the minds of those, on whose good or bad opinion, might depend the liberty or im-

prisonment of the person attacked. I have now had a pretty long intercourse with the press ; but, except in America, I certainly never did meet with any thing so wicked and base as this.—These vermin have, I find, long been attacking me, and I was shown, in London, several of their placards, against the walls, with my name in it. As the means of exciting curiosity, and of getting a few shillings, this might be well enough ; nor am I, as far as relates to myself, at all disposed to blame them ; leaving them to answer for their wilful falsehoods, I grudge them nothing that they can get by me, to whom they cannot possibly do any harm. But, Mr. Finnerty is less known ; with him the case is different ; and, therefore, for his sake, and for the sake of others, whom they may calumniate, I will just state to the reader, that they have, in the most unequivocal terms, and in the boldest manner, asserted, that I DESERTED from the army. Let the reader now peruse the following authentic documents, which were long ago published ; and then I am sure he will want nothing more to satisfy him, as to the degree of credit which is to be given to any thing which they assert.

" By the right hon. major lord Edward Fitzgerald, commanding his Majesty's 54th Regiment of Foot, whereof lieut. gen. Frederick is colonel.—These are to certify, that the bearer hereof, WILLIAM COBBETT, Serjeant Major in the aforesaid regiment, has served honestly and faithfully for the space of eight years, nearly seven of which he has been a non-commissioned officer, and of that time he has been five years Serjeant Major to the regiment ; but having very earnestly applied for his discharge, he, in consideration of his good behaviour, and the services he has rendered the regiment, is hereby discharged.—Given under my hand and the seal of the regiment, at Portsmouth, this 19th day of December, 1791. EDWARD FITZGERALD.

" Portsmouth, 19th Dec. 1791.—Serjeant Major Cobbett having most pressingly applied for his discharge, at major lord Edw. Fitzgerald's request, general Frederick has granted it. General Frederick has ordered major lord Edw. Fitzgerald to return the Serjeant Major thanks for his behaviour and conduct during the time of his being in the regiment, and major lord Edward adds his most hearty thanks to those of the General."

*Botley, 12th January, 1809.*

COBBETT'S  
COMPLETE COLLECTION OF  
**State Trials:**

To be completed in Thirty-Six Monthly Parts, forming Twelve large Volumes in Royal Octavo,

The Second Part of the above Work will be published on the 1st of February. By some very respectable communications which have been made to me from gentlemen of the profession of the law, it appears that the intention which I originally entertained with respect to the *Pleadings*, was much misunderstood. Upon that subject, however, I trust all misunderstanding has been completely removed by the assurance given in the Register of the 31st of Dec. that the whole of those Pleadings will be scrupulously retained: And in order to remove all professional doubts, as to how far this new and enlarged Edition of the State Trials may, with safety, be cited as authority in the Courts, and relied on as of equal authenticity with the former, I think it right to state, that it is intended to be a literal transcript of the last edition, as far as that edition extends; that where I have inserted fuller and better reports of any Cases, or of any parts of Cases, the text of the old Edition will nevertheless be retained; and that the new matter will be distinguished in a manner not to be mistaken, and be distinctly pointed out in the Table of Contents to each Volume. To such Gentlemen as may happen to be in possession of curious Trials, or of documents relating to Trials of the description of those to be contained in this Work, I shall be much obliged for a communication of them. If the document, or paper, whether in print or manuscript, be requested to be preserved, great care shall be taken of it.

**OFFICIAL PAPERS.**

*Lord Moira's Reasons for disapproving the Armistice and Convention of Cintra. (Concluded from p. 32.)*

HAD it been impracticable to reduce the French army to lay down its arms unconditionally, still an obligation not to serve for a specified time might have been insisted upon, or Belleisle might have been prescribed as the place at which they should be landed, in order to prevent the possibility of their reinforcing (at least for a long time) the armies employed for the subjugation of Spain. Perhaps a stronger consideration than the merit of those terms presents itself. Opinion rela-

tive to the British arms was of the highest importance, as it might influence the confidence of the Spaniards, or invite the nations groaning under the yoke of France, to appeal to this country, and co-operate with it for their deliverance. The advantages ought, therefore, to have been more than usually great, which should be deemed sufficient to balance the objection of granting to a very inferior army, hopeless in circumstances, and broken in spirit, such terms as might argue, that notwithstanding its disparity in numbers, it was still formidable to its victors. No advantages seem to have been gained that would not have equally followed from forcing the enemy to a more marked submission. The gain of time as to sending succours into Spain cannot be admitted as a plea; because it appears that no arrangements for the reception of our troops in Spain had been undertaken previous to the Convention; and this is without reasoning on subsequent facts.—The Convention in Egypt, which has been advanced as a parallel case, appears to me inapplicable. No object beyond the dislodgment of the French from Egypt was there in question. In the present instance, the operation of the Convention upon the affairs of Spain was a consideration of primary interest; and in that view, the inevitable effect of some of the articles offers itself to my mind as liable to material objection.—I trust that these reasons will vindicate me from the charge of presumption, in maintaining an opinion contradictory to that professed by so many most respectable officers: for even if the reasons be essentially erroneous, if they are conclusive to my mind (as I must conscientiously affirm them to be), it is a necessary consequence that I must disapprove the Convention.—MOIRA, General.—Dec. 27, 1808.

**SPANISH REVOLUTION.—Fourteenth Bulletin of the French Army of Spain, dated Madrid, Dec. 5, 1808.**—[The following are passages of the 14th Bulletin which were abridged in vol. xiv. p. 1019.]

A Butcher's boy from Estramadura, who commanded one of the gates, had the audacity to require the duke of Istria should go himself into the town with his eyes blindfolded. Gen. Montbrun rejected this presumptuous demand with indignation. He was immediately surrounded, and effected his escape only by drawing his sword. He narrowly escaped falling a victim to the imprudence with which he had forgot that he had not to make war with

civilized enemies.—To take Madrid by assault might be a military operation of little difficulty; but to engage that great city to surrender, by employing alternately force and persuasion, and by rescuing the people of property, and real good men, from the oppression under which they groaned: this was what was really difficult. All the exertions of the emperor, during these two days, had no other end. They have been crowned with the greatest success.—It would have been difficult to form a conception of the disorder that reigned in Madrid, if a great number of prisoners, arriving in succession, had not given an account of the frightful scenes of every description, of which that capital presented the spectacle. They had intersected the streets, erected parapets on the houses; barricades of balls of wool, and of cotton, had been formed; the windows had been stopped with mattresses. Those of the inhabitants who despaired of a successful resistance, were flying into the fields; others who had preserved some share of reason, and who preferred appearing in the midst of their property before a generous enemy, to abandoning it to the pillage of their fellow-citizens, demanded that they should not expose themselves to an assault. Those who were strangers to the town, or who had nothing to lose, were for a defence to the last extremity, accused the troops of the line, of treason, and obliged them to continue their fire.—The enemy had more than 100 pieces of cannon mounted; a more considerable number of two and three-pounders had been dug up, taken out of cellars, and tied upon carts, a grotesque train, and in itself sufficient to prove the madness of a people abandoned to itself. But all means of defence were become useless. The possessors of Retiro are always masters of Madrid. The emperor took all possible care to prevent the troops from going from house to house. The city was ruined if many troops had been employed. Only some companies of sharp-shooters advanced, and the emperor constantly refused to send any to sustain them. At eleven o'clock the prince of Neufchatel wrote the annexed letter, No. 3.—His majesty at the same time ordered the fire to cease on all points.—At five o'clock gen. Morla, one of the Members of the Military Junta, and Don Bernardo Yriarte, sent from the town, repaired to the tent of his serene highness the major general. They informed him that the most intelligent persons were of

opinion that the town was destitute of resources, and that the continuation of the defence would be the height of madness; but that the lowest classes of the people, and the crowd of men strangers to Madrid, wished to defend themselves, and thought they could do it with effect. They required the day of the 4th to make the people listen to reason.—During the night the most mutinous withdrew themselves from the danger by flight, and a part of the troops was disbanded. At ten o'clock gen. Belliard took the command of Madrid; all the posts were put into the hands of the French, and a general pardon was proclaimed.—From this moment, men, women, and children, spread themselves about the streets in perfect security. The shops were open till eleven o'clock.—All the citizens set themselves to destroy the barricades and repave the streets, the monks returned into their convents, and in a few hours Madrid presented the most extraordinary contrast, a contrast inexplicable to those unaccustomed to the manners of great towns. So many men, who cannot conceal from themselves what they would have done in similar circumstances, express their astonishment at the generosity of the French. Fifty thousand stand of arms have been given up, and 100 pieces of cannon are collected at the Retiro. The anguish in which the inhabitants of this wretched city have lived for these four months cannot be described. The Junta was without influence; the most ignorant and the maddest of men had all the power in their hands, and the people at every instant massacred, or threatened with the gallows, their magistrates and their generals.—The general of brigade, Maison, has been wounded. Gen. Bruyere, who advanced imprudently the moment the firing ceased, has been killed. Twelve soldiers have been killed, and fifty wounded. This loss, so trifling for an event of so much importance, is owing to the smallness of the number of troops suffered to engage: it is owing besides, we must say, to the extreme cowardice of all those that had arms in their hands against us.—The artillery, according to its usual custom, has done great services. Ten thousand fugitives, who had escaped from Burgos and Somosierra, and the second division of the army of reserve, were on the 3rd within three leagues of Madrid; but being charged by a picquet of dragoons, they fled, abandoning forty pieces of cannon, and 60 caissons.—A meritorious trait cited. An old general

retired from the service, and aged eighty years, was in his house at Madrid, near the street of Alcala—a French officer entered, and took up his quarters there with his party. This respectable old man appeared before him, holding a young girl by the hand, and said, “I am an old soldier; I know the rights and the licentiousness of war; there is my daughter; I give her 900,000 livres for her portion; save her honour, and be her husband.” The young officer took the old man, his family, and his house, under his protection. How culpable are they who expose so many peaceful citizens, so many unfortunate inhabitants of a great capital, to such misfortunes—The duke of Dantzig arrived at Segovia on the 3d. The duke of Istria is gone in pursuit of the division of Pena, which having escaped from the battle of Tudela, took the route of Guadalaxara. Florida Blanca, and the Junta, had fled to Toledo. They did not think themselves in safety in that town neither, and have gone to take refuge with the English.—The conduct of the English is shameful. On the 20th Nov. they were at the Escorial to the number of 6000 men. They passed some days there. They pretended they would do nothing less than pass the Pyrenees, and come to the Garonne. Their troops are very fine, and well disciplined. The confidence with which they had inspired the Spaniards is inconceivable. Some hoped that this division would go to Somosierra; others, that it would come to defend the capital of so dear an ally. Scarcely were they informed that the emperor was at Somosierra, when the English troops beat a retreat on the Escorial. From thence, combining their march with the division which was at Salamanca, they have taken their course towards the sea. “Arms, powder, and clothing, they have given to us,” said a Spaniard, “but their soldiers came only to excite us, to lead us astray, and to abandon us in the critical moment.” “But are you ignorant?” answered the French officer, “of the most recent facts of our history. What have they done for the Stadtholder, for Sardinia, for Austria? What have they done recently for Russia? What have they done still more recently for Sweden? They every where foment war; they distribute arms like poison; but they shed their blood only for their direct and personal interests. Expect nothing else from their selfishness.” “Still,” replied the Spaniard, “their cause was ours. Forty thousand English, added to

our forces at Tudela, and at Espinosa, might have balanced the fortune of the war and saved Portugal. But at present, that our army of Blake on the left; that of the centre, and that of Arragon on the right are destroyed; that Spain is almost entirely conquered, and that reason is about to complete its submission, what is to become of Portugal? It is not at Lisbon that the English ought to defend themselves, they ought to have done so at Espinosa, at Burgos, at Tudela, at Somosierra, and before Madrid.”

*Fifteenth Bulletin, dated Madrid, Dec. 7.*

His majesty has named the general of artillery, Senarmont, general of division. The major Legur has been named adjutant commandant. The life of this officer had been despaired of, but he is now out of danger. The count Khrazinski, colonel of the Polish light horse, though ill, has always wished to charge at the head of his corps. The sieurs Babecki and Wolugurski, quarter-masters, and Surzeyski, a soldier of the Polish light horse, who have taken standards from the enemy, have been named members of the legion of honour. His majesty has moreover granted to the Polish light horse eight decorations for the officers, and so many for the soldiers. The chief of squadron, Lubienki, reconnoitred, on the 2nd, the remains of the army of Castanos, near Guadalaxara. They were under the command of general Pena. Castanos was said to have been deposed by the General Junta. The duke of Infantado has been one of the principal causes of the misfortunes his country has suffered; he was the principal instrument in England, in its lamentable progress against Spain; it was he who was employed by that country to cause dissensions between the father and the son; to overturn the throne of Charles, whose attachment to France was known; to excite outrages against the first minister of that sovereign; to elevate to the supreme power that young prince, who, by his marriage with a princess of the ancient house of Naples, had drunk in that hatred against the French, from which that house had never departed. It was the duke of Infantado who played the principal part in the conspiracy of the Escorial, and it was to him that the power of generalissimo of the armies of Spain was confided at that time. He was afterwards seen taking the oath of allegiance at Bayonne between the hands of king Joseph, as colonel of the Spanish guards. On his return to Madrid, we saw him throw off the masque, and shew himself

openly the man of the English. It was in his house that the ministers of England were lodged; it was in his society that the agents accredited and secret of that power lived. After having exhorted his fellow-citizens to a mad resistance, he was seen, with a cowardice equal to his treason, flying from Madrid to Guadalaxara, under the pretext of going to bring reinforcements, withdrawing himself by this stratagem from the dangers into which he had drawn his fellow-citizens, and shewing no anxiety except for the English agent, whom he carried off in his own carriage, and whom he served for an escort. And what will he gain by this conduct? He will lose his title, his property, valued at 2,000,000 livres a year; he will go to London, to seek the contempt, the disdain, and ingratitude with which England has always rewarded the men who sacrifice their country to the injustice of her cause. The Bulletin continues, "As soon as the report of the chief of squadron, count Lubenski, was known, the duke of Istria put himself in march, with 16 squadrons of cavalry, to observe the enemy. The duke of Belluno followed with the infantry. The duke of Istria arrived at Guadalaxara, and found there the rear-guard of the enemy, which was filing towards Andalusia, dispersed it, and made 500 prisoners. The general of division Ruffin, and the brigade of dragoons of Bordesault, informed that the enemy were moving towards Aranjuez, proceeded to that place. The enemy were put to flight, and all these troops were immediately put in pursuit of all those that are flying towards Andalusia.—The general of division Laboussaye entered the Escurial on the 3rd. Five or 600 peasants wished to defend the convent, but were driven out by a brisk attack.—Every day contributes to dissipate the remains of the stupor into which the inhabitants of Madrid had fallen. Those who had concealed their moveables and precious effects, are bringing them back to their houses. Their shops are furnished as in ordinary times. The barricades, and all the other preparations of defence, have disappeared. The taking possession of Madrid has been executed without disorder, and tranquillity reigns in all parts of that great town. A fuzileer of the guards having been found with a number of watches upon him, and being convicted of having stolen them, has been shot in the principal place of Madrid. We have found in that city 200,000 pound weight of powder; 10,000 balls; 2,000,000 pound weight of lead;

100 pieces of field artillery, and 120,000 muskets, mostly English. The disarming continues without any difficulty, all the inhabitants conform to it with the greatest willingness; they return with eagerness and good faith to the royal authority which rescues them from the mischievous influence of England, from the violence of factions, and the disorders of popular movements. The king of Spain has created a regiment which bears the name of the "Royal Foreigners," into which are admitted the deserters and the Germans who were in the service of Spain. He has also formed a Swiss regiment, called that of Reding the younger, that officer having conducted himself like a real Swiss patriot, and in a manner very different from gen. Reding. The one has deserved well from his countrymen, and will every where obtain esteem; the other, generally despised, will go to the taverns of London to enjoy a pension of some hundreds of pounds sterling, badly earned, and paid with disdain.—He must emigrate from the continent. The regiments of Royal Foreigners, and Reding the younger, consist already of many thousands of men.—The 5th and 8th corps of the army of Spain, and three divisions of cavalry, are but passing the Bidassoa; they are yet very far from being in line, and yet a very great number of victories have been obtained, and the greatest part of the business is done.

*Sixteenth Bulletin, dated Madrid, Dec. 8.*

The duke of Montebello bestows much praise on the conduct of the general of brigade, Ponzet, in the battle of Tudela; on that of generals Lefebvre, on the general of brigade of artillery Couin, and also on that of his aid-de-camp, Guchenene, who was wounded. He makes particular mention of three regiments from the Vistula. General of brigade Augerau, who charged at the head of the division of Morlot, distinguished himself. M. M. Viry and Labedoyere took a piece of artillery in the midst of the enemy's line. The latter was slightly wounded in the arm.—His majesty has appointed colonel Pepin, general of brigade, and the Polish major Kliko, colonel. The Polish colonel Kasionouski, who was wounded, has been appointed a member of the legion of honour.—Ruffin, general of division, having passed the Tagus at Aranjuez, pushed on to Ocana, and cut off the retreat of the remains (*débris*) of the army of Andalusia, who were retiring to Andalusia, and who, being frustrated in this design, have thrown

themselves upon Cuenca. — The divisions of cavalry under general Lasalle and Melbaud, have directed their march for Portugal, by Talavera de la Reina. — The duke of Dantzic arrived this day at Madrid with his division of the army. — Marshal Ney, with his division, has reached Guadalaxara, coming from Saragossa. — His majesty, anxious to spare the inhabitants of that town from the horrors inseparable from a capture by storm, was unwilling that Saragossa should be attacked, before the intelligence of the events at Madrid, and of the dispersion of the Spanish armies should be known there. If, however, that city should obstinately make resistance, mines and bombs should obtain satisfaction. — The 8th division has entered Spain. General Delaborde is about to establish his head quarters at Vittoria. — The Polish division, under the orders of general Valence, arrived this day at Buitrago. — The English are retreating on all sides. The division of Lasalle has, however, fallen in with 15 men, whom they have put to the sword. — They were stragglers, or men who had lost their way. — Marshal Mortier will arrive on the 16th in Catalonia, to turn the enemy's army, and to form a junction with the generals Duhesme and St. Cyr. — On the 23d of Nov. the breach in the castle of Trinity of the city of Rosas, was found on approaching it, to be practicable. On the same day, the English landed 400 men at the foot of the castle. A battalion of Italians marched against them, killed 10 men, wounded above that number, and drove the rest into the sea. — About 30 vessels were observed to come out of the harbour of Rosas, which induced a belief that the inhabitants had begun to evacuate the town. — On the 24th, the advanced guard of the enemy encamped on the Fluvia, consisting of about 5 or 6000 men, commanded by general Alvarez, came in several columns, to attack the posts of Navara, Pientos, Armodas, and Garrigas, occupied by general Souham's division. The 1st regiment of light infantry, and 4th bat. light infantry, were alone opposed to the enemy, sustained the attack with firmness, and finally put them to flight. — The enemy has been repulsed on the other side of the Fluvia with considerable loss in killed and wounded. Several prisoners have been made, among whom are col. Le Brun, the second in command of the expedition, and col. of the regiment of Tarragona, and the major and a captain of that regiment.

*Seventeenth Bulletin, dated Madrid, Dec. 10.*

His majesty reviewed yesterday on the Prado, the duke of Dantzic's corps, which arrived the day before yesterday at Madrid; he expressed his satisfaction at these brave troops. To-day he reviewed the troops of the Confederation of the Rhine, forming the division commanded by gen. Léval. The regiments of Nassau and Baden behaved well. — The regiment of Hesse Darmstadt did not sustain the reputation of the troops of that country. — The colonel and major appear to be men of moderate talents. — The duke of Istria set off on the 6th for Guadalaxara. He scoured the whole road from Saragossa and Valencia—made 500 prisoners, and took a great deal of baggage. At Bastau a battalion of 500 men, summoned by the cavalry, were broken in upon. The enemy's army beaten at Tudela, Catalayud, abandoned by its generals, and a great number of soldiers, was reduced to 6,000 men. On the 8th at midnight, the duke of Istria attacked, at Santa Cruz, a corps which covered the flight of the enemy's army. That corps was closely pursued, and a thousand prisoners taken. It wished to throw itself into Andalusia by Madridego. It appears to have been forced to disperse in the mountains of Cuenca.

*Intercepted Correspondence, published by the French.*

THE following Intercepted Correspondence has been published by the French. It is annexed to the 17th Bulletin of the French army, and is introduced by the following short preface: "We found at Madrid at the duke de Infantado's, two caskets, containing the papers of the princess of Asturias, in which are things of the greatest importance. The passage in a letter from her mother, dated on the 15th Jan. 1806, informs us of the opinion which the queen of Sicily has herself of the English. These letters are full of proofs of the conspiracy which was forming to break the friendship between France and Spain."

*Copy of what is written in sympathetic ink in the Letter of Queen Charlotte to the Princess of Asturias : dated Jan. 15, 1806.*

" My beloved child, I am infinitely uneasy at your situation, your health, and the increased grief you will have in hearing of our cruel fate. — But rely upon my truth. Do not give credit to any alarm, which they will not fail in charity to give you, and be prudent. — I shall write to you with perfect sincerity, and believe no other news, for I promise the heart and

tenderness of my dear child to hide nothing from you—Do not then believe any one but me—We keep all in good health—but are dreadfully uneasy—Massena has been with 50,000 men on our frontier, since this fatal and accursed debarkation of the English, who with a cowardly perfidy without example, have, after having compromised us, quitted us at the moment of the greatest danger. They have ruined us—Buonaparte causes nothing to be said or written, and we shall be lost indeed. We have but 8,000 men in arms—During the two years and a half the French remained with us, they exacted that we should make no recruiting. They have thereby rendered all our force useless, and we are thus at their mercy, without the hope of defending ourselves against a force of 50,000 men, and if they choose of 100,000 men. Austria destroyed, and for 50 years null—in short, it is a misery without example, to which our holy religion alone can make us resigned, that only consolation in all our miseries. We are packing up every thing, for from the frontiers to Naples is the affair of six or seven days, and we cannot suffer ourselves to be made prisoners. Thus we are preparing every thing for a disastrous and eternal departure, and it wrings my heart. The king has sent cardinal gen. Ruffo to Rome, and has sent also to Paris. But neither Fesch, nor Alquier, nor Eugene Beauharnois, nor Massena can, as they say, stop the march of the troops. Hence, St. Theodore, who has been dispatched to join Gallo, and to speak to him upon these points, remains at Rome to watch over our affairs; and the cardinal is gone to find Buonaparte either at Munich or at Paris, to try to save us. Your good father is ready to satisfy the general wish, and abdicate and leave Francis the (hereditary prince) king, reserving to himself a good pension, the fruit of a part of the advances made by him to the royal finances. Many think this will be sufficient to calm the storm; but I do not think it, and am convinced that the enemy wish for the kingdom of Naples. If the danger approach, we shall retire to Messino and into Calabria, to defend ourselves, at least there, and prevent the capture of Sicily—Judge—Leopold, your two sisters, a daughter-in-law, seven months pregnant, who will lay in at Messina, Palermo, God knows where, two little children so interesting. In fine every body is in tears. No one will remain. Every one, frightened by the last time, wishes to go off. We have neither squadron, nor any thing but two

ships—it is a real desolation.—You shall know every thing—be prudent—do not shew any ill temper at the harsh things that may be told you.—Let them pass—they signify nothing.—God will judge us and posterity.—No false interpretations—Your two sisters are in deep affliction. Leopold and Francis will go to Calabria to defend the posts.—In short, God has permitted it—his holy will be done—Think, my dear child, of re-establishing your health—Conduct yourself well—this life is short—the other is eternal and sure—Do not afflict yourself at any thing—I shall find means to inform you of every thing that concerns us—But do not make yourself uneasy—God will aid us—Adieu my dear child—think of your health—try to restore it—I bless you—I embrace you, and am for life your tender mother and friend.—In the narrative of Colugno there is nothing written. Inform me if you have received all safe, and can read it. Adieu, with heart and soul, yours wholly, notwithstanding my dreadful misery.”

*Copy of what is written in sympathetic ink in the Letter from Queen Charlotte to the Princess of Asturias, Jan. 30, 1806.*

“ DEAR and beloved child, do not be uneasy at our fate; only take care of your health. God will have pity upon us, and nothing will happen unto us. If we are obliged to fall back upon Sicily, I will endeavour, when we shall be all assembled together, to send a vessel, under the pretence of quieting the heart of the queen for her daughter: but, in fact, to assure you, my beloved child, with respect to our fate.—Be prudent, do not speak out and let every thing be said.—I have nothing to reproach myself.—Joseph Bonaparte is believed to be destined to the throne of Naples—that is villainous enough—God permits it; we must bow our heads.—Francis conducts himself exemplarily, and no one can behave better;—Isabella (his wife, the daughter of the queen of Spain), is in the 8th month of her pregnancy; but happily she has such apathy, is so silly and null that she feels nothing warmly—it is good for her health.—Your sisters and myself have not the same happiness.—I cannot express to you, my child, our torments—but God will aid us; do not be uneasy, and think only of your health—Let them criticise, talk and discuss every thing without feeling the misery of it—Be attached to your good husband—Be prudent, wise—I rely on you.—Adieu, dear child, I have many things to say to you, but time presses—I embrace you from the

bottom of my heart, and am your tender mother and friend.—I write to the queen and to your husband—to the former, to speak to her of her child—to the other to tell him that it is his duty to write to me, and that he should be seen—Adieu, I will endeavour to send you intelligence relative to me—Be tranquil on our account—I embrace you—Adieu.”

*Eighteenth Bulletin, dated Madrid, Dec. 12.*

The Central Junta of Spain had but little power; the greater part of the provinces paid it little submission, and all of them deprived it of the administration of the finances. It was under the influence of the lowest class of the people: it was governed by the minority. Florida Blanca was without any credit. The Junta was under the controul of two men, the one named Lorenzo Calvo, a grocer of Saragossa, who had in a few months obtained the title of ‘Excellency.’ He is one of those violent men who appear in revolutions,—his honesty was more than suspected. The other is called Tilly, formerly condemned to the gallies as a thief; the younger brother of a man of the name of Gusman, who formerly played a part under Robespierre during the reign of terror. As soon as any of the members of the Junta opposed the violent measures that were proposed, these two wretches immediately called out ‘treason,’ and immediately a mob was collected under the windows of Aranjuez. The extravagance and wickedness of these dangerous men, was manifested upon all occasions. As soon as they learnt that the emperor was at Burgos, and he would soon be at Madrid, they published a declaration of war against France replete with insults and folly.—On the 11th, when the general of division Lassalle, who was pursuing the enemy, arrived at Talavara de la Reyna, where the English had passed triumphantly, ten days before, saying they were going to relieve the capital, a frightful spectacle met the eyes of the French. A body cloathed in the uniform of a Spanish general was suspended from a gallows, and pierced with a thousand bullets. It was the general Benito San Jean, whom his soldiers in their terror, and as an excuse for their commander, cruelly sacrificed. The bishops of Leon and Astorga, and a great number of ecclesiastics, distinguished themselves by their good conduct and their apostolic virtues; the general pardon offered by the emperor, has produced a great effect. The destruction of the duties odious to the people and contrary to the prosperity of the state, and the measures

which leave the numerous class of monks no longer any uncertainty respecting their lot, produced a good effect. The general animadversion is against the English.—The peasants say in their language, that at the approach of the French the English went away to mount the wooden horses (ships.)

*Nineteenth Bulletin, dated Madrid, Dec. 13.*

Rosas surrendered on the 6th by capitulation. Two thousand men have been made prisoners. A considerable quantity of artillery was found in the place. Six English ships of the line which were at anchor in the harbour, would not carry away the garrison.—The emperor this day reviewed the whole of the united troops of the duke of Dantzic, beyond the bridge of Segovia. Sebastiani’s division has marched for Talavara de la Reyna. The breaking up of the Spanish troops is observed on every side. The new levies which were attempted to be raised, disperse on all sides, and return to their homes. The details which we learn from the Spaniards respecting the Central Junta, are all of a nature to place them in a most ridiculous point of view. That assembly is already become an object of contempt with all Europe. Its members, to the number of 86, have bestowed upon themselves titles and ribbons of every sort, and an annual allowance of 60,000 livres. Florida Blanca was a real man of Spain: he is now ashamed of the dishonour he has brought upon his old age. As usually happens in such assemblies, two or three persons domineer over all the rest, and these two or three persons were in the pay of England.—The opinion held by the city of Madrid respecting the Junta is notorious: they are as much the object of the mockery and derision, as they are of the detestation of the inhabitants of the capital. Never was there so fine a December—it is like the beginning of spring. The emperor avails himself of the fine weather to remain in the country one league from Madrid.

*Proclamation by Buonaparte.*

SPANIARDS.—You have been misled by perfidious men. They have engaged you in a senseless struggle, and you have had recourse to arms. Is there one amongst you, who after a moment’s reflection upon all that has passed, would not be convinced that you have been the sport of the eternal enemies of the Continent, who take delight in witnessing the effusion of Spanish and French blood? What possible result would attend even the success of some

campaigns? An endless war upon the soil, and a tedious uncertainty respecting the fate of your properties and lives. Within the space of a few months, you have been delivered up to all the afflictions of popular factions. The defeat of your armies has been the work of some marches; I have entered Madrid: the rights of the war would justify me in such a signal example, by washing away in blood the outrages offered to me and to my nation: but I have listened to the dictates of clemency only. Some men, the authors of all your calamities, shall alone be punished. I shall speedily drive from the Peninsula that English army which has been sent to Spain, not for the purpose of assistance to you, but to inspire you with a false confidence and to mislead you.—I had declared to you in my Proclamation of the 2nd of June, that I wished to be your regenerator. To the rights which had been ceded to me by the princes of the last Dynasty, you wished that I should add the right of conquest. That shall not make any alteration in my intention. I am even disposed to praise all that may be generous in your efforts; I am willing to admit, that your real interests have been concealed from you, that the real state of things has been disguised from you. Spaniards, your destiny is in your hands. Reject the persons which the English has spread amongst you:—let your king be assured of your affections and your confidence, and you will be more powerful and more happy than ever you have been. All that obstructed your prosperity and your grandeur, I have destroyed; the chains which bore down the people, I have broken; a free Constitution gives you a limited and constitutional, instead of an absolute Monarchy. It depends upon yourselves whether this Constitution shall still continue in your land.—

(To be continued.)

---

BRITISH ARMY IN SPAIN.—*From the London Gazette, dated Downing-street, Jan. 10, 1809.*

DISPATCHES, from which the following are extracts, were, on the 8th instant, received at the office of lord visc. Castle-reagh, one of his majesty's principal Secretaries of State, from lieut.-gen. sir John Moore, k. b. commander-in-chief of his majesty's forces employed in Spain:

*Benevente, Dec. 28, 1808.*—Since I had the honour to address you upon the 16th, from Toro, the army has been almost

constantly marching through snow, and with cold that has been very intense. The weather, within these few days, has turned to rain, which is much more uncomfortable than the cold, and has rendered the roads almost impassable. On the 21st the army reached Sahagun; it was necessary to halt there in order to refresh the men, and on account of provisions. The information I received was, that marshal Soult was at Saldana with about 16,000 men, with posts along the river from Guarda to Carrion.—The army was ordered to march in two columns, at 8 o'clock on the night of the 23rd, to force the bridge at Carrion, and from thence proceed to Saldana. At 6 that evening, I received information that considerable reinforcements had arrived at Carrion from Palencia, and a letter from the marquis de la Romana informed me that the French were advancing from Madrid either to Valladolid or Salamanca. It was evident that it was too late to prosecute the attempt upon Soult, that I must be satisfied with the diversion I had occasioned, and that I had no time to lose to secure my retreat.—The next morning lieut.-gen. Hope, with his own division and that of lieut.-gen. Fraser, marched to Majorga. I sent sir David Baird, with his division, to pass the river at Valmira, and followed lieut.-gen. Hope on the 25th with the reserve and light brigades, by Majorga, Valderas, to Benevente. The cavalry under lord Paget followed the reserve on the 26th; both the latter corps entered this place yesterday. We continue our march on Astorga. Generals Hope and Fraser are already gone on; sir David Baird proceeds to-morrow from Valencia; and I shall leave this with the reserve at the same time; lord Paget will remain with the cavalry, to give us notice of the approach of the enemy; hitherto their infantry have not come up, but they are near, and the cavalry is round us in great numbers; they are checked by our cavalry, which have obtained, by their spirit and enterprise, an ascendancy over that of the French, which nothing but great superiority of numbers on their part will get the better of.—The diversion made by our march on Sahagun, though at great risk to ourselves, has been complete; it remains to be seen what advantage the Spaniards in the South will be able to take of it; but the march of the French on Badajoz was stopped when its advanced guard had reached Talaveira de la Reine, and every thing disposable is now turned

in this direction.—The only part of the army which has been hitherto engaged with the enemy, has been the cavalry, and it is impossible for me to say too much in their praise. I mentioned to your lordship, in my letter of the 16th, the success brig.-gen. Stewart had met with in defeating a detachment of cavalry at Rueda. Since that, few days have passed without his taking or killing different parties of the French, generally superior in force to those which attacked them. On the march to Sahagun, lord Paget had information of 6 or 700 cavalry being in that town. He marched on the night of the 20th from some villages where he was posted in front of the enemy at Majorga, with the 10th and 15th hussars. The 10th marched straight to the town, whilst lord Paget, with the 15th, endeavoured to turn it. Unfortunately, he fell in with a patrol, one of whom escaped, and gave the alarm. By this means the French had time to form on the outside of the town, before lord Paget got round. He immediately charged them, beat them, and took from 140 to 150 prisoners, amongst whom were two lieutenant-colonels and 11 officers, with the loss, on our part, of 6 or eight men, and perhaps 20 wounded.—There have been taken by the cavalry from 4 to 500 French, besides a considerable number killed; this since we began our march from Salamanca. On his march from Sahagun, on the 20th, lord Paget, with two squadrons of the 10th, attacked a detachment of cavalry at Majorga, killed twenty, and took above 100 prisoners. Our cavalry is very superior in quality to any the French have; and the right spirit has been infused into them by the example and instruction of their two leaders, lord Paget and brig.-general Stewart.

*Astorga, Dec. 31, 1808.*—I arrived here, yesterday; major gen. Fraser, with his division, will be at Villa Franca this day, and will proceed on to Lugo. Lieut. gen. Hope with his division, stopped yesterday two leagues from this, and proceeds this morning, followed by sir David Baird. The two flank brigades go by the road of Penfereda. I shall follow with the reserve and cavalry, to Villa Franca, either this night or to-morrow morning, according as I hear the approach of the French. The morning I marched from Benevente, seven squadrons of Buonaparte's guards

passed the river at a ford above the bridge. They were attacked by brig. gen. Stewart, at the head of the piquets of the 18th and 3rd German light dragoons, and driven across the ford. Their colonel, a general of division, Lefebre, was taken, together with about 70 officers and men.—The affair was well contested. The numbers with which brig. gen. Stewart attacked were inferior to the French; it is the corps of the greatest character in their army; but the superiority of the British was, I am told, very conspicuous. I inclose, for your lordship's satisfaction, lord Paget's report of it.

*Benevente, Dec. 29, 1808.*—Sir; I have the honour to inform you, that about nine o'clock this morning I received a report that the enemy's cavalry was in the act of crossing the river at the ford near the bridge. I immediately sent down the piquets of the night, under lieut. col. Otway of the 18th. Having left orders that the cavalry should repair to their alarm posts, I went forward to reconnoitre, and found four squadrons of imperial guards formed and skirmishing with the piquets and other cavalry in the act of passing. I sent for the 10th hussars, who having arrived, brig. gen. Stewart immediately placed himself at the head of the piquets, and, with the utmost gallantry, attacked. The 10th hussars supported in the most perfect order. The result of the affair, as far as I have yet been able to collect, is about 30 killed, 25 wounded, 70 prisoners, and about the same number of horses. It is impossible for me to avoid speaking in the highest terms of all those engaged. Lieut. col. Otway and major Bagwell headed the respective night piquets. The latter was slightly wounded. The utmost zeal was conspicuous in the whole of my staff; and I had many volunteers from headquarters, and other officers of your army. Amongst the prisoners is the general of division Lefebre, (who commands the cavalry of the imperial guard,) and two captains. Our loss is, I fear, nearly 50 men killed and wounded. I will send a return the moment I can collect the reports. I have the honour to be, &c. PAGET, lieut. gen.

I have forwarded the prisoners to Badajosa. On the other side of the river the enemy formed again, and at this instant three guns of Captain Donovan's troop arrived, which did considerable execution.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 3.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1809. [Price 10d.

"I trust, however, that no such villains as these will obtain influence with our ministers, and prevail upon them to be suspicious and tardy, in their operations for the assistance of the Spanish patriots. This is the only fair opportunity, that has offered for checking the progress of Napoleon. It is the only cause, to which all the people of England have heartily wished success. In all probability, it is the last opportunity that will offer, for enabling us to give a turn to the long-flowing tide of success. And, if we neglect this opportunity; if we waste the precious hours that are now given us for action, in doubts, hesitations, and delays, we, or, at least, those amongst us, who shall be found to have been the cause of such conduct, ought to perish; or, which would be better, to linger out a life of misery, loaded with the curses of all good men."—POLITICAL REGISTER, 2nd July, 1808. Vol. XIV. page, 10.

[65] [65]

## SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—With respect to Spain, the interesting question now appears to be, not what will be the conduct of the people of that country; not what will be the result of the war; not whether Joseph or Ferdinand will be king; not whether despotism, in one shape or other, will be re-established, or long-lost freedom be restored. Neither of these is now the interesting question, with regard to Spain. The interesting questions are: 1st, what is the fate, that will probably attend our army in that country; and 2nd, whether our ministers, and especially the War-Secretary, be not to blame for the injury and the deep dishonour, arising from a retreat, or rather a flight, before the enemy, without having stricken a single blow, without having so much as drawn a trigger, offensively, against the armies of Napoleon.—With respect to the first question, much need not be said, it being next to impossible, that a knowledge of the event should not, in a few days, have rendered all discussion unnecessary. I shall, therefore, as far as relates to this, confine myself to a few remarks upon the delusion which has been practised, and is still practising upon this credulous nation. We have been led on, by lie after lie, till we are upon the eve of having the truth forced upon us. All that Napoleon said, in his bulletins, was "false;" all were falsehoods that came through that channel; while, on the other hand, we were desired to believe, that our army, stated at 45 thousand strong, were upon the point of driving the French out of the peninsula. The strength of the Spanish armies was carried to 150 thousand. An affected laugh was set up at the threats of Buonaparté. In short, just the reverse of the truth has, from first to last, been promulgated amongst us; so that, had it not been for the bulletins of

Napoleon, we should, up to the hour when Sir John Moore's dispatches, or, rather, a few parts of those dispatches, were published, have been in the confident hope of a successful issue to the campaign. Now, indeed, the truth is pretty well known, in spite of the garbling of the General's dispatches. There is nobody, who, at best, expects any thing better than the escape of our men, with the loss of stores, ammunition, waggons, cannon, and horses; and, I, for my part, shall think that we are very lucky, if we avoid a capitulation, far, very far less favourable to us, than the Convention of Cintra was to the French; a capitulation, negociated, perhaps, by that very JUNOT, who, together with his army, ought now to have been prisoners in England. It is difficult to say, whether our commander, in Spain, has had it in his power to prevent this danger, and this probable result; but, I must express my opinion, that his marches and counter-marches do appear to me quite unaccountable. I do think, nay I am nearly sure, that, if a man like my Lord Cochrane; nay, if Lord Cochrane himself, though not a military officer, had had under his command an army of 28 thousand men, in Spain, he would have done *something* with them; or, at any rate, that he would not have remained, *doing nothing*, till he was half surrounded by a force, before whom he knew he must flee. "A diversion," indeed! What diversion has Sir John Moore made, in favour of the Spaniards? Where are we to look for the evidences of that diversion? Our army, without marching to meet the enemy, sees him come into Spain, and take the capital. It then remains inactive, or, at best, marches about without attacking the enemy; and, having waited in this situation, till the enemy has half surrounded it, runs away. This is not the sort of diversion that Lord Coch-

rane has been making. "Nothing," says Lord Collingwood, "can exceed the activity and zeal, with which his Lordship pursues the enemy. The success which attends his enterprizes clearly indicates with what skill and ability they are conducted; besides keeping the coast in constant alarm, causing a total suspension of the trade, and harassing a body of troops employed in opposing him, he has, probably, prevented those troops, which were intended for Figueras, from advancing into Spain, by giving them employment in the defence of their own coasts." Here we have evidences of a real diversion. Such is the effect of command, when in the hands of a man of skill and indefatigable attention to his business, and, besides, of undaunted bravery. One frigate; only one frigate and about 300 men, under the command of such a person, is worth an army, ay, and a fleet into the bargain, committed to the hands of loungers, milk-sops, or, what is full as bad, boozing companions. I do not know, that Sir John Moore answers to either of these descriptions; but, it does appear to me, that, if he had possessed any great degree of energy, he would not have been in the situation, described in his last dispatches. A commander should be equally distinguished for his *enterprize* and his *prudence*; he may possess one and not the other; but, in the conduct of Sir John Moore, I, for my part, can discover no satisfactory evidence of either. He knew that the French armies were in Spain; it is not to be believed, that he was ignorant either of their strength or their distribution; and, therefore, if he found himself too weak for attack, or resistance, he should have *retreated in time*, from doing which there was nothing to prevent him. There may be some circumstances, of which we yet are ignorant, and which, when explained, may fully justify this commander; but, with my present information, this is my view of the matter.—As to the 2nd question; whether our ministers, and especially the War-Secretary, be not to blame for the injury and the deep dis-honour, arising from a retreat, or, rather, a flight, before the enemy, without having stricken a single blow, without having so much as drawn a trigger, offensively, against the armies of Napoleon; as to this question, the first thing to be noticed; the first fact to be stated, is, that our army, exclusive of the expence of transports to carry it about, costs us 23,000,000 of pounds sterling a year, money enough to main-

tain more than *half a million* of men, allowing for each man *double* what he receives in subsistence. The next fact is, that the regular infantry, at home, in the month of July last, amounted to not less than *a hundred thousand*, and the regular cavalry to not less than *twenty-five thousand* men. Now, then, let us bear in mind, that it was early in July, that the king, in his speech to the parliament, promised us that he would give assistance to the Spaniards, having before solemnly made the same promise to the Deputies from Spain; that, at this time, or soon after, Napoleon's decree, relating to the new constitution of Spain, was received in England; that, in the middle of the same month Joseph Buonaparté set out on his way to Madrid; that, early in August, Joseph Buonaparté was driven from Madrid; that, it was not till after this, that Buonaparté, who was then at Paris, set out to the North of Europe; and that, it was not until about *the 1st of November*, that any part of the French army entered Spain, except that part, which had been either beaten or put to flight, or besieged, by the Spaniards, and that the whole of the coast of Spain and Portugal was at our absolute command.—Along with the intelligence, that Joseph had been driven from Madrid, we received the intelligence, that Napoleon had taken measures for drawing an immense army from Germany, and other parts, in order to send it to Spain; so that, so early as *the second week in August*, we had to prepare for meeting the French in Spain. I have before shown, that we had the means of meeting them; and, now, every man in England has a right to ask, to demand, to insist upon knowing, why those means were not duly and effectually employed; why this immense army has been raised, and is kept up, if, upon this occasion, it was not proper to make use of it; *what this army is for*, if not for the purpose of meeting, and fighting with, that enemy, who seems to have sworn our destruction.—It is now stated, as correct, that we have about 28 thousand men in Spain; 25 thousand foot and 3 thousand horse. Where are the other 70 or 80 thousand foot and 22 thousand horse? *Why* are they not in Spain too? An army of about 60 thousand men, one fifth horse, is as great as is necessary for almost any enterprize; it is as great as can be well brought into one engagement in any part of the world. But, it appears to me, that there was nothing that ought to have prevented the ministers from having an army of 70 thousand foot

and 15 thousand horse at, and in the neighbourhood of Madrid, early in the month of October last, weeks before the French army set foot in Spain. Having collected a great force at the capital of the kingdom; having made all due preparations as to supplies of every kind; having put arms into the hands of the Spaniards and amply furnished them with necessaries for the field, we should, supposing the *people* to have been on our side, have been ready to meet the French, not only with a fair chance, but with almost a certainty of victory; if, indeed, they had dared to approach, which, it is more than probable, would not have been the case. —But, “it was thought unwise to leave ‘a French army in our rear *in Portugal*.’” Well, even supposing it to have been wise to clear Portugal first; Portugal was actually cleared early in September; and, at most, it required but 30 thousand men to do that. Nay, *after* the Convention of Cintra; after all the blundering and confusion arising from the ever-famous trio of commanders; even after all that, there was plenty of time to send a complete army into Spain, to face Buonaparté on his way to Madrid, without reckoning upon the assistance of a single Spanish soldier. But, as was foreboded in the words of my motto, “the precious hours ‘were wasted in suspicions and delays;’” in hesitations and bickerings, in the conflicts of hostile interests and hostile caprices. —It will be pretended, perhaps, that the JUNTAS, in Spain, did not, at first, wish for our assistance; that they kept aloof, until they saw Napoleon approaching. But, the answer to this is, that an English ministry, having the interest and the honour of their country at heart, would have well weighed the question, whether it was not then *too late* to do any thing effectual; whether it was not, then, too late to send an army capable of meeting that of the French; and, if they found that to be the case, they would have sent *no troops at all*. The fact is, however, that, when the application was made, it was *not* too late; for, it was not too late even when our army was ordered to march from Portugal into Spain, which orders must have gone from Whitehall early in the month of September, full two months before the French re-entered the Spanish dominions; so that, there is not the smallest excuse, as to want of time. —But, “our ministers ‘were deceived as to the amount of the Spanish force, and the disposition of the

Spanish people.” This has not, that I have heard of, been, as yet, openly asserted; and, whenever it is asserted, there ought to be no dispute about the fact; but, we shall have a right, a full and complete right, to ask, *how they came to be deceived* with respect to either of these most important points. So early as the month of July the Spaniards had Deputies here, and we had Deputies, or Agents, in Spain, whose *expences* will not fail to make a respectable figure in the next account of the distribution of the public money. Since about the middle of October, still weeks before the arrival of the French army in Spain, and still time enough for us to send out troops, we have had MR. JOHN HOOKHAM FRERE in Spain. Could not *he* send correct information, respecting the force of the Spaniards and the disposition of the people of Spain? Besides, in answer to all pretences and excuses of this sort, we have a right to say to the ministers, “you ‘charge us, and you make us pay, from 50 ‘to 100 thousand pounds a year for *secret services abroad*, and as much for *secret services at home*; and, though we have ‘not had the soul to ask you what you do ‘with either, and for *what purposes*, what ‘purposes indeed, you *can* want the latter; yet, surely, you cannot, with the ‘charge of 50 or 100 thousand a year in ‘your hand, for *secret services abroad*, ‘have the impudence to plead want of ‘correct information, as to the strength of ‘the Spanish troops and the disposition ‘of the people of Spain?’” —There is, and there can be, no maintainable justification for the measures, or the inactivity, which have led to the known dreadful situation of our army. We know, that our government had in its hands, two months before Napoleon set foot in Spain, an army quite sufficient to meet him there; to meet him in a country, whence, by the people of that country, his brother and his troops had been driven in disgrace; we know, that they had the means of sending this our army to Spain, and even to the passes of the Pyrenees, long before he, with his army, could possibly arrive at that point; and, we know, that they have so managed matters, that there is only about 28 thousand English troops in Spain to make head against a French army of, at the very least, 100 thousand men. These facts are undeniable. If we are told of *difficulties* in the transporting of so large an army, we ask, what you do, then, with the 23 millions of pounds sterling a year? What is

the use of this immense army, if you cannot, at two months notice, send it to a spot at the distance of ten day's sail? For what reason; from what motive, do you keep this army on foot, and make us pay so dearly for it? For what reason do you strip the country of its most able labourers, leaving to cultivate the land few but the aged, the children, the halt and the lame? For what reason; tell us for what reason you do this, if you are unable to bring to the striking-place men sufficient to cope with the enemy? Is it "to defend this country?" Why, those against whom you would defend it, are now in Spain. Besides, has not the pretence for keeping on foot this terribly large army, always been, that you wanted a *disposable* force; a force to send abroad; and, if you now plead difficulties in sending that force abroad, what becomes of this pretence?—As to the ground that may be taken by a set of persons, wrangling for place, it is a matter of indifference to me, and to every man who wishes well to his country. The ground that we have to take, the ground that the nation has to take, is described in a very few words: either the ministers were duly informed of the internal state of Spain, or they were not. If they were not, they have, in that way, shown their want of zeal or of capacity for great affairs; and, if they were, they have knowingly sent an army of 28 thousand men, to sneak away at the approach of the enemy, to be captured, or to be cut to pieces; to be placed in a situation, leaving it no choice but that of *death or dishonour*.—To the individuals, and to the army, as a body, we, indeed, cannot well attach any dishonour; but, that is not the point. The point is, what the world will say of the conduct of this nation, during this struggle respecting Spain. That is the point; and, the judgment of the world must be, that the cause, in which we engaged was (if Napoleon finally succeed) lost; and that we were beaten and disgraced. And, have not the people of this kingdom; the people who pay 23 millions of pounds sterling for the support of an army, and who are yearly called upon for fresh sacrifices; have not this suffering people a right to demand a knowledge of the cause of this great injury and disgrace? What, to us; what, to this nation, are all the boasts about the "flourishing and improved state of our military establishment?" What are these, to us, if the army produce no effect upon the enemy? The excellence of armies, like that of every

thing else, is proved by their utility; by the good effects which they produce. There is a man, taking the name of a "PATRIOT LOALIST," who is about to publish, "THOUGHTS ON LIBELS;" "and an Impartial INQUIRY into the PRESENT STATE OF THE BRITISH ARMY: which will contain Considerations on the *Difficulty of convicting notorious Defamatory Writers*; and on the Effects which arise from *delay in making them the Subjects of a Prosecution*; also, "a Convincing Explanation of the flourishing and improved State of the Military Establishment of England, under the actual Commander in Chief; and Reflections on the *Danger with which the Constitution is threatened by systematic printed Attacks, upon the Public and Private Characters of Princes, and the High Officers of the Executive Government*.—Inscribed (without permission) to his ROYAL HIGHNESS, FREDE-RICK, DUKE OF YORK AND ALBANY, and published by T. EGERTON, "at the Military Library, Whitehall."—Why, you ass; you thick-brained sot; you stupidest of all mortals; why did you fix upon this moment, of all others, to write upon such a subject? Generals and armies, who gain victories, need no pamphlets written in their praise; and those who gain none will be praised in vain. "Libels" indeed! "Prosecutions," you empty-headed, malignant wretch! "Difficulties of *convicting*!" Oh, it is truly decent, at such a time, and under such a dedication, to address the public! Fool; convict us Buonaparté, fool! Prosecute, arraign, and convict him. That is the man we want to see put down. Read his "libels;" his speeches and bulletins. Attack him; face him with your "thoughts" on libels. When you have done this, then come and tell us your thoughts, and, perhaps, we may hear you; but, at present, we think it something a little suspicious when we see the eulogist of military character appeal to the law of Libel for proofs of the truth of his assertions.—Recollect, that the SUPREME JUNTA of Spain began their labours by an edict for limiting the press. They have, at present, I presume, but little leisure for "Thoughts on libels," and for the removing of the "difficulties of producing conviction of writers." Recollect that, beast; and keep your "thoughts" to yourself.—For my part, I wonder, that no one has yet hit upon the scheme of trying the force of the law upon Buonaparté. He is

a sad libeller, and particularly of our army, besides being a most atrocious violator of property, and especially that of “princes.” What think you, dolt, of an ejectment against him for Hanover and Mecklenberg Strelitz and the Duchy of Brunswick? Is there no action, whether of trover, or of detainer, or of any other queer name that would lie against him? Do, try if you can find out some way of coming at him. Of assault and battery you would have no “difficulty in convicting” the fellow, and, in that way, you would come at him in the king’s name, and might have a whole rookery of silk gowns arrayed against him. All you have to do is to catch him. That, indeed, may be “difficult;” but, until you can do that, you may as well hold your stupid tongue, and not pester the public with dirty pamphlets, about libels, “inscribed ‘to Frederick, Duke of York and Albany.’”

“LOYALTY.”—I mean not vulgar loyalty, but loyalty in the modern sense of that word, as it is understood and passes current at Whitehall and in the neighbourhood; and of which loyalty I shall, under the indulgence of the reader, give some very striking instances. At one time in my life, when, indeed, I was at too great a distance from my country to be able to know much of what was passing in it, I was dreadfully alarmed for the safety of the throne. I heard of nothing but meetings of Corresponding Societies, United Irishmen, and Jacobins. Little did I imagine, that the loyal were so numerous as I have, since my return, found them to be; nor, indeed, was it till very lately that I obtained a complete and authentic return of their numbers: I mean, the Lists of place-men, pensioners, and reversionaries, contained in the Report, laid before the House of Commons, by the Finance Committee, in the month of June last. Complete, indeed, this return is not; but, defective as it is, it is quite populous enough to remove, from the mind of any reasonable man, all fears as to a want of loyalty in these United Kingdoms.—There are many individuals, and many whole families, to whose distinguished loyalty it would well become me to attempt to do justice; and, as opportunities offer, I may, perhaps, towards many of them, be able to perform this very pleasing and not unuseful task. At present I shall confine myself to the displaying of the proofs of this most estimable quality in the Viscount CASTLEREAGH and some of his relations; and, I select this nobleman, not so much

because he is one of the ministry, as because he is well known to have been, of all mankind, the man after the late Pitt’s own heart; the man, of all others, the nearest resembling him in talents as well as in disposition; and, the only man on earth, perhaps, whom he could have found to execute his commands in Ireland.—In making this display, it will not be sufficient merely to state the sum that each person annually receives. We must also see how long they have been in the receipt of it; whence will naturally proceed a calculation of the total amount received, including, of course, the compound interest thereon; because, it is clear, that if a man has been in the receipt of a thousand a year, out of the taxes, during the space of twenty-eight years, he has, in fact, received fifty-six thousand pounds from the public, or, which is the same thing, taken from the public that, which if left in its hands, would, at common interest, have been worth fifty-six thousand pounds.—Having made this preliminary remark, I shall now proceed to my statement, numbering the offices, as I go, for the sake of brevity in the case of reference.

1. LORD CASTLEREAGH. Secretary of State, £.6,000 a year.
2. BRIGADIER GEN. STUART, (brother of Lord Castlereagh) Under Secretary of State, £.2,000 a year.
3. Same person.—Gen. upon the Staff; upon our famous Staff, £.1,500 a year.
4. Same person.—Lieut. Col. of a regiment of dragoons, £.500 a year.
5. LORD HENRY MOORE (a first cousin of Lord Castlereagh) joint muster-master gen. in Ireland, a patent place, £.2,100 a year.
6. MR. JOHN ORMSBY VANDELEUR (a first cousin of Ld. Castlereagh) Commissioner of the excise in Ireland, £.1,200 a year.
7. MESSRS. JOHN STAPLES and THOMAS STAPLES (first cousins of Ld. Castlereagh) Examinators of the customs in Ireland, £.918 a year.
8. LORD HENRY SEYMOUR } (uncles of and } Ld. Castlereagh) Prothonotary in the Court of King’s bench in Ireland, £.12,511 a year.
9. Same persons.—Clerk of the crown in the King’s bench in Ireland, £.427 a year.
10. Same persons.—Filazers in the King’s bench in Ireland, £.1,105 a year.

11. LORD ROBERT SEYMOUR (uncle of Lt. Castlereagh) Craner and Wharfinger of the Port of Dublin, £1,930 a year.
  12. LORD GEORGE SEYMOUR (uncle of Lord Castlereagh) Commissioner of Excise in England, £1,500 a year.
  13. Same person.—Harbour Master of the Port of Christiansted, in the island of Saint Croix, about £1,000 a year.
  14. Same person.—Harbour Master of the Port of Fredericksted, in Saint Croix; about £1,100 a year.
  15. Same person.—Naval Officer of the Port of Christiansted, in St. Croix; about £900 a year.
  16. Same person.—Naval Officer of the Port of Fredericksted, in St. Croix; about £1,000 a year.
  17. LORD GEORGE SEYMOUR, } The  
and his son } rever-
- G. H. SEYMOUR, 11 years old } sion of  
the office of Craner and Wharfinger }  
of the Port of Dublin, valued at }  
£1,930 a year, and now held, as }  
just stated, by Lt. Robt. Seymour.

The total annual amount, paid by the public to these several persons, is £36,691; and, Nos. 8, 9, 10 and 11, having been held since 1766, the total sum, which, through those channels only, has been drawn from the public, including the compound interest, is, if my calculation be correct, £2,160,056. Two millions, one hundred and sixty thousand, and fifty-six pounds. No. 12, has been held for many years past; as long, perhaps, as the others; but *certainly* for about eight years past, as will be seen by referring to a list of places, in the second Volume of the Political Register; and, without including in the calculation, the several sums of money, which Lord Castlereagh has received, in the shape of salary, under the administrations of the late Pitt, Lord Sidmouth, and the present; without including in the calculation, these sums, amounting to an average of about £5,000 a year, for the last sixteen or eighteen years; passing over the interest and even principal of this large item; the total amount, drawn from the public by the above persons, does not fall much, if any, short of £3,000,000. *Three millions of the public money*, drawn from the public, during the last 30 or 40 years, by six or seven persons!—There's *loyalty* for you! “Jacobins and Levellers” blush for shame! “Jack Cades,” hide your heads! Cease your grumbling, you villainous rebellious ruffians, you bloody-

minded dogs, do cease your grumbling, and come forth with voluntary sacrifices, at this hour of peril!—I, sometime ago, produced striking proofs of loyalty in the person and family of Mr. Garnier, who, as Apothecary General and Officer upon the Staff, residing, all the while quietly at Wickham, condescended to receive from the public, and, in part, of course, from the nasty, dirty, sweaty, smeary, hard-fisted and hard-favoured “Jacobins and Levellers,” the sum of thirteen thousand a year and upwards; but, the loyalty of this gentleman and his family is nothing, when compared with that of those above-named. Here we see noble Lords, who, rather than his Majesty's business should go unperformed, willing to become, Muster-Masters, Prothonotaries, Clerks, Filazers, Excisemen, and Wharfingers; and, Lord George Seymour, not satisfied with what he can do in his life-time, has, we see, entailed this task of loyalty upon his son, though, at present a child of only eleven years old. Nay, so anxious is this nobleman to assist His Sovereign, in carrying on the affairs of government, that he has not confined his loyal exertions to England and Ireland; but has procured himself, through Lord Castlereagh (into whose patronage these offices came) to be appointed Naval Officer and Harbour Master, in the ports of our newly-conquered Island of Santa Croix, where, as appears by the Gazette of that place, he was formally appointed in the month of June last, by “His Excellency General Har—“ court;” though, from mere modesty, I suppose, the appointment was never announced in the Gazette at home.—There are some circumstances belonging to this appointment, that are worthy of particular notice. The island of Santa Croix, it is well known, was taken, about a year ago, by Sir Alexander Cochrane and General Bowyer, who, jointly, according to the usual custom in such cases, made appointments of Harbour Masters and Naval Officers. They bestowed the four offices upon three persons, in the following manner. Captain Thomas Cochrane, of the Navy, son of the Admiral, was appointed Harbour Master of the two ports; Captain Pickmore, of the Navy, was made Naval Officer of the port of Fredericksted; and Brig. Gen. Ramsay, Naval Officer of the port of Christiansted. All these appointments were set aside by Lord Castlereagh, and the four officers united in the person of his uncle, Lord George Seymour, who was before, as we have seen, and had

been for many years, a Commissioner of the Excise in England; and, if my information be correct, this noble Harbour Master has demanded, from the persons who held these offices from the time of the capture to the date of his appointment in the island, the amount of the fees, received by them, or in their behalf, from the date of his commission in England. Look at this, you cursed “Jacobins and Levellers,” and continue in your disloyal ways if you can!—With respect to the propriety of making sinecures of such offices, I have no hesitation to say, that the practice is wrong. But, such having been the practice; and the Commanders by sea and land having uniformly appointed officers of the navy and army, to be Harbour Masters and Naval Officers in the conquered ports, the commanders, upon the occasion now referred to, cannot be blamed for what they did. At Martinico, Sir Charles Grey appointed his son, Capt. Grey, to be Harbour Master; at Surinam, Lord Hugh Seymour appointed his son to the same situation; Sir Samuel Hood, upon the reduction of Surinam, this war, appointed Capt. Maxwell, of the Centaur, who still holds the post; and upon the capture of Curaçoa, Capt. Wood, of the Latona, was appointed Harbour Master. None of these appointments were set aside. All were confirmed. These posts of profit appear to have been considered as a perquisite of the Navy and Army, particularly the former, in the gift of the capturing commanders. The three officers, amongst whom this perquisite was divided upon the occasion referred to, are, by the navy and army, well known to be very meritorious men. They were, at any rate, men engaged in actual and very perilous service, if we think only of the nature of the climate, under which they were compelled, and are still compelled, to remain. Lord George Seymour was not in the West Indies. He had run no risks from cannon balls or from yellow fever. He had, all his life long, been safe at home, and, for a considerable part of that life, a Commissioner of Excise, with a salary of £. 1,500 a year. He had had no buffettings of the seas to endure. His life had not been a life of suffering and of toil in that service, in that arduous service, in that navy, upon the fidelity, skill, valour, and zeal of the officers of which the safety of this kingdom does now almost solely depend, and towards which officers, therefore, policy as well as justice, imperatively forbid us to

discover the slightest symptoms of ingratitude.—Admiral, Sir Alexander Cochrane, after a life of service, after being, like his gallant nephew, Lord Cochrane, actually afloat one half of the time since he came into the world, and after many hard fought battles, has a large family with a very scanty purse; and, surely, this trifling temporary provision for his son might have been left to his enjoyment. —The only pension; the only gratuity from the public, to the family of Cochrane, as far as I have been able to discover, or to hear of, is a pension of £. 200 a year to the Lady of Sir Alexander Cochrane, which pension was formerly enjoyed by the Countess dowager of Dundonald, who, out of twelve sons, had seven in the navy and army. There are of this family, at this time, seven persons in the country's service: namely, Sir Alexander Cochrane, commander in chief on the West-India station; Lord Cochrane, in the Mediterranean; Capt. Archibald Cochrane, of the Fox frigate, in the East-Indies; Capt. Thomas Cochrane of the Jason frigate, in the West Indies; Capt. Nathaniel Cochrane of the Alexandria frigate, in the North seas; Lieut. Colonel Cochrane of the 36th regiment of foot; and Capt. William Cochrane of the 15th Regt. of dragoons, now in Spain. Where the Seymours, the Moores, the Staples, and the Vandeleurs are; where they are existing; what actual service they are upon, I must leave the reader to find out; but, I am afraid, the remainder of our lives will pass away before we shall hear as much of them, as we heard of Lord Cochrane alone in the Gazette of the other day.—Surely, when all this was considered; when the long and arduous services of this family were taken into view; when the family, and the pecuniary circumstances of Sir Alexander Cochrane were thought of, Lord Castlereagh might have spared to Captain Cochrane a few thousand pounds of fees, as Harbour-Master, in an island, recently reduced by his father. If to no one else, this little forbearance might, one would think, have been thought due, to Lord Cochrane, in behalf of so near a relation. To Lord Cochrane, who has grown up to manhood amidst battles and sieges; whose whole life, body and mind, has been devoted to the service of the country; and who, while, from his modest demeanour, he excites envy in no man, is the boast even of that glorious service, barely to be enrolled in which is no mean distinction. If there had been only this consideration,

the trifling thing of Harbour-Master might, surely, have been left where the Admiral and General had placed it. But, Lord George Seymour wanted more; wanted more of good service; wanted fresh and additional opportunities of demonstrating the feelings of his loyal heart; and, the appointments were set aside by the authority of his nephew, whose mandates were conveyed, too, through the channel of "His Excellency" General Harcourt, a pupil of the Wellesley school, and since, as the people of that place *well know*, a candidate for Lincoln. This title of *Excellency* to a Lieutenant Governor is new in the West Indies, which now, it seems, are, in this respect, as well as in all others, to bend to the predominance of the *East*.— Reader, what is your opinion, as to the influence of these things upon the fate of the country? How do you think, that such a distribution of the favours of the crown, and of the money of the people, is likely finally to operate with respect to defence against a mighty conqueror, who is, and who naturally must be, an implacable foe? What do you think must be the feelings of those, who, after having, under a pestilential climate, fought and subdued, see the fair fruits of their toils and dangers bestowed upon those, who have remained at home in security and ease? Who see, that which might have diminished their *wants*, carried to augment the *luxuries* of others? The answer to these questions I leave to your sense of justice and of policy.

Botley, 19th January, 1809.

#### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Proclamation by Buonaparte.* (*Concluded from p. 61.*)

But should all my efforts prove fruitless, and should you not merit my confidence, nothing will remain for me but to treat you as conquered provinces, and to place my brother upon another throne. I shall then place the crown of Spain upon my own head, and cause it to be respected by the guilty; for God has given me power and inclination to surmount all obstacles.— Given at our Imperial Camp at Madrid, Dec. 8, 1808.—(Signed) NAPOLEON.— H. B. MARET.

*Municipal Sitting.*—Madrid, Dec. 9, 1808.

This day at 11 o'clock in the morning, the hour appointed for the opening of the Sitting, the following persons assembled:—The Corregidor; the Regidors; the Alcaldes; the deputies of the Third Estate; the heads of the Assembly of the Masta;

[the Council of the Masta is composed of the great proprietors in cattle.] the Procurators; the Algnazil-Majors; the Suffragan Bishops; the Vicars; the Body of the Curates and beneficed Clergy; the heads of the different Commonalties; the body of the Nobility; the deputies of the five principal Corporations; and all the deputations representing the 64 divisions of the city of Madrid.—The Corregidor rose to address the meeting, and informed them, that he had had the honour of being admitted to present the homage of his respect to his imperial and royal Majesty, and to lay at the foot of his throne the tribute of gratitude of the inhabitants of Madrid for the kindness and clemency which his Majesty had shewn towards that city.—The Corregidor expressed to his imperial and royal Majesty the happiness which his presence shed over the city, and the desire with which all the inhabitants were animated to deserve and to justify such a peculiar mark of favour.— The Corregidor observed, that his imperial and royal Majesty had condescended to converse with him in the most benevolent manner, and added, that the object of this meeting was to acquaint the Deputies of the city of Madrid with the beneficent intentions of his Majesty. Accordingly he had to repeat to them in the same terms he had heard them, the sentiments of his Majesty, and the favourable dispositions he entertained towards the whole of Spain; adding, that the fate of Madrid would depend upon its own conduct. That that would be a happy and prosperous one, if the inhabitants adhered faithfully to the constitution, and acknowledged with sincerity, for their legitimate king, Don Joseph Napoleon I.; but that, on the other hand, Spain should be reduced to a province of France.—Here, the Corregidor, drew a faithful picture of the good nature of king Joseph, who had employed his best offices and entreaties for the conservation of that capital, as well as of the neighbouring cities, and who treated them with the tenderness of a generous father.— The Corregidor impressed upon the minds of all the deputies, that the presence of the King in his capital, should be considered as the greatest advantage that could be wished for.—Accordingly, the Deputies deeply penetrated with the same sentiments, and anxious to contribute their best endeavours for the happiness of the inhabitants of Madrid, determined humbly to implore his imperial and royal Majesty to indulge the capital with the

presence of the King, that city, and even all Spain, being convinced of the signal advantages which must be derived from the wisdom of his government.—The Deputies insisted, that a fresh tribute of thanks should be presented to his imperial and royal Majesty, for the kindness with which he had treated that city, which his triumphant arms had conquered, and for the generous pardon of what had happened during the absence of king Joseph.—His imperial and royal Majesty is also to be implored to extend pardon to those whom fear had induced to desert the city, as well as to all the peasants who had taken up arms.—His imperial and royal Majesty is also finally to be implored, that he will be pleased to order his troops to respect property, the holy temples, the religious institutions; in a word, the property of every class.—This humble supplication is to be laid before his imperial and royal Majesty, and is to be presented to him by a deputation taken from among the representatives of the city of Madrid.—It was resolved, in the same sitting, that a tribute of the most lively gratitude should be presented to the king Joseph Napoleon, whose happy intercession with his august brother, the emperor of the French, saved the city of Madrid.—His royal Majesty shall be humbly supplicated to grant the favour of his presence to the city of Madrid, that under his just and beneficent government, good order, justice, and tranquillity, may be restored within its walls.—His royal Majesty shall be implored to employ his royal good offices with his imperial brother, that pardon may be obtained to the absent, and to those inhabitants, who had taken up arms.—The present proces-verbal shall be presented to his imperial and royal Majesty. [Here follows several thousand signatures.]—On the 11th a similar meeting was held, for the deputies of the inhabitants of the parishes, and who acceded to a similar measure, which was likewise accompanied with a vast number of signatures.

#### *Imperial Decrees relative to Spain.*

In our imperial camp, at Burgos, Nov. 12, 1808.—Napoleon, emperor of the French, king of Italy, and protector of the Confederation of the Rhine.—Considering that the troubles of Spain have been principally the effect of the plots formed by several individuals, and that the greater part of those who have been engaged in them, have been misled or deceived:—Wishing to pardon the latter, and to grant

them oblivion of the crimes which they have committed against us, our nation, and the King, our brother:—Wishing at the same time to mark those, who, after having sworn fidelity to the King, have violated their oath: who, after having accepted places, have made use of the authority confided to them, only to betray the interests of their Sovereign; and who, instead of employing their influence to enlighten the citizens, have only made use of it to mislead them:—Wishing, in fine, that the punishment of great culprits, should serve as an example for posterity, to all those who, placed by Providence at the head of nations, instead of directing the people with wisdom and prudence, pervert them, involve them in the disorder of popular agitations, and precipitate them into the miseries of war:—We have decreed and decree as follows:—Art. 1. The dukes of Infantado, of Hijar, of Medina Celi, of Ossuma, the marquis of Santa Cruz, the counts of Ferran-Nunez and Altamira, the prince of Castel-Franco, the sieur Pierre Cevallos, ex-minister of state, and the bishop of Santander, are declared enemies of France and Spain, and traitors to the two crowns. As such they shall be seized and carried before a military commission. Their property moveable and immovable, shall be confiscated in Spain, in France, in Italy, in Naples, in the Papal States, in the kingdom of Holland, and in all the countries occupied by the French army, to pay the expences of the war.—2. All sales and dispositions, whether with the living, whether testamentary, made by them or their attorneyes, subsequent to the date of the present decree, are declared null and of no value.—3. We grant, in our name, and in the name of our brother the king of Spain, general pardon and full and entire amnesty to all Spaniards who, in one month after our entrance into Madrid, shall have laid down their arms and renounced all alliance, adherence, and communication with England; shall rally round the constitution and throne, and shall return to order, so necessary to the repose of the great family of the continent.—4. Are not excepted from the said pardon and amnesty, neither the members of central and insurrectional Juntas, nor the generals and officers who have borne arms, provided that both the one and the other conform to the dispositions established by the preceding article.—(Signed) NAPOLEON.

In our imperial camp of Madrid, Dec. 4, 1808.—Napoleon, emperor of the

French, king of Italy, &c.—Considering that the Council of Castile has shewn, in the exercise of all its functions, equal falsehood and febleness:—That after having published throughout the kingdom the renunciation of king Charles the 4th, and of the princes Don Fernando, Don Carlos, Don Francisco, and Don Antonio, of the crown of Spain, and after having recognised and proclaimed our legitimate rights to the throne they had the meanness to declare, in the eyes of Europe, and posterity, that they only subscribed these different acts, with interior and perfidious restrictions:—We have decreed and decree as follows:—Art. 1. The members of the Council of Castile are removed as cowards, and unworthy of being the magistrates of a brave and generous nation.—2. The presidents and procurators of the King shall be arrested as hostages. The other members of the Council shall be required to remain at Madrid in their houses, under pain of being prosecuted and punished as traitors; are nevertheless excepted from the present disposition, all the members of the said Council who shall not have signed the declaration of the 11th August 1808, as dishonourable to the dignity of the magistrate as to the character of the man.—(Signed) NAPOLEON.—H. B. MARET.

In our imperial camp of Madrid, Dec. 4, —Napoleon emperor of the French, &c.—We have decreed and do decree as follows:—Art. 1. The Court of Cessation, erected by the second title, Art. 101 of the constitution of the kingdom of Spain, shall be immediately organized.—(Signed) NAPOLEON.

In our imperial camp of Madrid, Dec. 4. Napoleon, emperor of the French, &c.—We have decreed, and do decree as follows:—Art. 1. The tribunal of the Inquisition is abolished, as contrary to the civil sovereignty, and authority.—2. The property belonging to the Inquisition shall be put under sequestration, and be united to the domain of Spain, to serve as a guarantee for the *Vales*, and for all other parts of the public debt.—(Signed) NAPOLEON.

In our imperial camp of Madrid, Dec. 4. Napoleon, emperor of the French, &c.—We have decreed, and do decree as follows:—Art. 1. The same individual cannot possess more than one commandery.—2. From the 1st of January next, every individual possessing several commanderies, shall designate the one he prefers preserving—the others shall revert to the disposal of the King.—(Signed) NAPOLEON.

In our imperial camp of Madrid, Dec. 4. Napoleon, emperor of the French, &c.—Considering that the religious of the different monastic orders in Spain are too multiplied:—That if a certain number be useful to assist the ministers of the altar in the administration of the sacraments, the existence of too considerable a number is injurious to the prosperity of the state.—We decree as follows:—Art. 1. The number of convents at present existing in Spain, shall be reduced to a third.—This reduction shall be produced by uniting the religious of several convents in one single house.—2. Dating from the publication of the present decree, no admission to the novitiate, no religious profession shall be permitted until the number of the religious of each sex shall have been reduced to the third of the number of the said religious now existing.—In consequence, and in the space of a fortnight, all the novices shall quit the convents into which they have been admitted.—3. All the regular ecclesiastics who wish to renounce their usual living, and to live as secular ecclesiastics, shall be free to quit their houses.—4. The religious who shall so renounce, conformably to the preceding article, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of a pension whose amount shall be regulated by their age, but which shall not be less than 3000 reals, nor exceed the maximum of 4000.—5. Upon the amount of the property of the convents which shall be suppressed in execution of the first article of the present decree, shall be raised the sum necessary to increase the portion of the cures, so that the minimum of the salary of the curates shall be raised to 2400 reals.—6. The property of the suppressed convents which shall be disposable after the raising of the sum ordered by the foregoing article, shall be united to the domain of Spain, and to be employed as follows:—1. The half of the said property to guarantee the *Vales* and other parts of the public debt.—2. The other half to reimburse the provinces and cities the expences occasioned by the supplying the French armies and the insurrectional armies, and to indemnify the cities and country for the damages, losses of houses, and other losses occasioned by the war.—(Signed) NAPOLEON.

In our imperial camp of Madrid, Dec. 4. Napoleon, emperor of the French, &c.—We have decreed, and decree as follows:—Art. 1. Dating from the publication of the present decree, the feudal rights are abolished in Spain.—2. All personal dues,

all exclusive rights of fishery, or other rights of the same nature, on the coasts, rivers, and banks of rivers, all bannalities of mills are suppressed.—Each shall be permitted by conforming to the laws, and give a free impulse to her industry.—(Signed)—NAPOLEON.

In our imperial camp of Madrid, Dec. 4,—Napoleon, emperor of the French, &c.—Considering that one of the establishments which are most injurious to the prosperity of Spain is that of the barriers existing between the provinces; We have decreed and decree as follows:—Art. 1. From the 1st of Jan. next, the barriers existing from province to province shall be suppressed.—The custom-houses shall be removed, and established on the frontiers.—(Signed)—NAPOLEON.

Napoleon, emperor of the French, king of Italy, protector of the Confederation of the Rhine, &c. &c.—Taking into our consideration, that one of the greatest abuses which have been introduced into the finances of Spain, arises from the alienation of the different branches of the imposts, and that nevertheless imposts are from their nature inalienable, we have decreed, and do decree as follows:—From the publication of the present Decree, every individual who shall be in possession, either by grant from the King, or by sale, or by any other means, of any portion whatever of the civil or ecclesiastical imposts, shall cease to receive them, and those from whom they may be leviable, shall be answerable for the payment of their respective imposts to the agents of the King or of the treasury.—The present Decree shall be published and registered in all the councils, courts, and tribunals, in order to its being carried into execution as a law of the State.—(Signed) NAPOLEON.—H. B. MARET.

*Extract from the Minutes of the Office of Secretary of State.—Imperial Camp at Madrid, Dec. 12, 1808.*

We Napoleon, emperor of the French, king of Italy, and protector of the confederation of the Rhine, have decreed, and do decree as follows:—Art. 1. All seignioral Courts of Justice are abolished in Spain.—2. There shall exist no other jurisdiction than the royal Courts of Justice.—3. The present Decree shall be published and registered in all the councils, courts, and tribunals, in order that it may be executed as the Law of the State.—(Signed) NAPOLEON.—H. B. MARET.

*Capitulation of the Town of Rosas.—Rosas, Dec. 5, 1808.*

CAPITULATION of the town of Rosas and of the castle of the Trinity, entered into between messrs. the adjutant in chief Dombrowski, chief of the staff of the Italian division, commanded by general Pino, and chevalier Pio, colonel commandant of the 2d French regiment of the line, appointed by general of division Reille, aid-de-camp of his majesty the Emperor and King, on the one part, and messrs. col. Don Pedro O'Daly, governor commandant of the fortress of Rosas, and of the castle of the Trinity, and Don Manuel Lemaury, col. of engineers, on the other part.—Art. 1.—The town and the fort shall be delivered in the course of the day, to the troops of his majesty the Emperor and King.—2. The garrison shall lay down their arms upon the glacis of the place, shall be prisoners of war, and conducted into France. The officers shall keep all that belongs to them.—3. Immediately after the signature of the present Capitulation, one gate of the town of Rosas, and one gate of the castle of the Trinity, shall be given up to two companies of grenadiers.—(Signed)—JEAN DOMBROWSKI, Adjutant-Commandant, Chief of the Etat-Major.—PIO, Colonel-Major.—DON PEDRO O'DALY.—MANUEL LEMAURY.—The present Capitulation is approved of.—General of Division commanding the siege, REILLE.

*Letter of the Supreme Junta to the Marquis de la Romana.—Dated, Tudela, Dec. 4, 1808.*

Most Excellent Sir,—The king and lord, Ferdinand VII. and in his royal name the Supreme Junta of government of the kingdom, omitting no means which can any ways promote the safety and prosperity of the nation, has thought proper to resolve, that your excellency is not only to command the army, of which you are general in chief, but also the armies of Old Castile, Leon, Asturias and Galicia, superintending with regard to all the said armies, the troops of the mass, and putting in requisition the horses, mules, and other measures, which are required to augment our army, and put it on that respectable footing which the present extraordinary circumstances require. His Majesty has been informed, and sees with the deepest concern, that to the want of subordination, cowardice is added by many, whence arises that scandalous desertion which excites astonishment in our allies and damps their general ardour. This conduct, so

contrary to the sentiments of true Spaniards, and which cannot be counteracted by mild measures, demands that your excellency should check it with all the rigour of military law, extending the punishment to all those who assist or protect deserters. For this purpose his Majesty invests your excellency with the most ample power which may be required, to cause yourself to be promptly and implicitly obeyed, and cause the enthusiasm which begins to slacken in the Provinces, and especially in Old Castile, to be revived. To attain that end, extraordinary and vigorous measures are required, calculated to secure the safety of the nation, which cannot be done without the prompt and exemplary punishment of the vile and degenerate wretches who deceive their country and their King, by usurping the title of their defenders, while they are selling them to the enemy. From that severe punishment, such justices and places are not to be exempted as shew any slowness in checking disorder and confusion, or do not execute your excellency's orders with the necessary punctuality and zeal. His Majesty invests you with such great authority, in order that you may be convinced of the implicit confidence which he places in your energy and zeal. The necessary orders have been dispatched for that purpose to the respective juntas of government, that they may possess full knowledge thereof, and obey your excellency, to whom I communicate the above royal order for your information, and compliance with the same. God preserve your excellency many years.—MARTIN DE GARAY.

*Ordinance of the Marquis in consequence of the above letter.—Dated, Leon, Dec. 1808.*

In pursuance thereof, I ordain that all the inhabitants of the kingdom of Castile, Leon, and Asturias and Galicia, of from 16 to 45 years of age, are immediately to arm themselves with such musquets, carbines, pistols, sabres, and every other description of arms as they have in their possession. That all young men unmarried without children, are to repair, without the least delay, to the places which shall be pointed out by the juntas of government in the respective provinces and districts, to be immediately incorporated with the armies. All other persons shall also arm to defend their respective provinces; all horses and mules belonging to any persons whomsoever, are put in a state of requisition, and immediately to be delivered up for the use of the armies.—All armourers and smiths are, in

preference to any other business, to devote their exertions to the fabrication of arms and pikes; the latter being destined for those inhabitants who cannot be supplied with any sort of arms.—All persons refusing to enlist or deliver up horses, mules, and other necessaries, shall be committed as traitors to their country, and be punished in an exemplary manner. All vile deserters shall be shot as soon as apprehended, without any exception or mercy. Cowards who in an engagement with the enemy are the first to run away and cause disorder and confusion, may be killed on the spot for their own punishment, and as an example to others.—All those gallant defenders of their country, worthy of the heroic Spanish names, who distinguish themselves by deeds of superior valour, shall be rewarded in such a manner that their names shall be handed down to posterity with those marks of public approbation which shall be best calculated to immortalize their glory.—MARQUIS DE LA ROMANA.

*Proclamation of Sir David Baird, dated Astorga, 1st Dec. 1808.*

THE events that have occurred in Biscay, and in the neighbourhood of the Ebro, have made it indispensably necessary that the British troops should be concentrated, in order more effectually to assist and support the Spanish nation in the heroic exertions she is applying for the defence of her independance. Under these circumstances, lieut.-general sir D. Baird, commander of the British division in Castile and Leon, informs the royal subjects of these kingdoms, that he has just received orders from his excellency sir J. Moore, commander in chief of his Britannic majesty's army in Spain, to unite his forces with those of the said general, without loss of time, by the road of Portugal.—The object of this movement is in no respect to evacuate Spain, or to abandon a cause so dear to Great Britain. The only design is to combine the whole of the British forces, in order to enable them to act in a situation where they can render their services more beneficial.—Galicia, strong by nature, does not require for its protection a more numerous army, nor can it possess a more gallant one than the army of the left; composed principally of the courageous youth of the kingdom (province), which is now united in Leon under the orders of the highly distinguished commander his excellency the marquis de la Romana. The resort of more troops, in the

present circumstances, in the defiles of the mountains, would be prejudicial, since they would consume the provisions and other resources of the country, without increasing its security.—To the worthy inhabitants of these kingdoms the most grateful acknowledgments are due from the British forces, for the hospitality and friendship with which they have been treated in every situation: and the lieut.-gen. hopes that the feelings of reciprocal attachment and respect will prevail, not only now, but that they will continue to animate both nations to the latest posterity.

—In taking leave of the subjects of this part of the Peninsula, the lieut.-gen. feels it to be his duty to exhort them, by the loyalty they owe to their sovereign, by the affection they bear to their families, and by all that is sacred in religion, to unite for the protection of their country.—Unless the government and the people combine their utmost efforts in this just and honourable cause, Spain will be exposed to the most serious danger; but if these endeavours be not wanting, under the direction of Divine Providence, all will terminate in victory and happiness.

*Capitulation of Madrid.*—From the *Madrid Gazette*, Dec. 7, 1808.—*Capitulation proposed by the Military and Civil Junta of Madrid, to his Imperial and Royal Majesty the Emperor of the French.*

Article I. The preservation of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Religion, without any other being legally tolerated.—Answer. Granted.—II. The liberty and security of the lives and properties of the citizens and other persons residing in Madrid, as well as of those in public employments: the preservation of their situations, or the option of their retiring from this court, if they should prefer it. Likewise the lives, privileges, and properties of the secular and regular ecclesiastics of both sexes, together with the respect due to the churches, all in conformity to our laws and customs.—Ans. Granted.—III. The lives and properties of all military officers, of rank, are likewise to be safe.—Ans. Granted.—IV. No person shall be liable to persecution, on account of their political opinions or writings, any more than those employed in a public capacity, for what they may have done hitherto in the exercise of their employments, or in obedience to the former government; nor shall the people suffer for the efforts which they have made for their defence.—Ans. Granted.—V. No other contributions shall be exacted beyond

the ordinary ones that have hitherto been paid.—Ans. Granted, till the realm shall definitively be organized.—VI. Our laws, customs, and courts of justice shall be preserved in their present constitution.—Ans. Granted, until the kingdom undergoes its definitive organization.—VII. The French troops and their officers shall not be quartered in private houses, but in military lodging houses and tents, and by no means in convents or monasteries; the privileges allowed to the respective classes by the laws being preserved.—Ans. Granted; it being well understood that both the officers and privates must have quarters and tents that are furnished conformably to the military regulations, unless the said buildings be insufficient.—VIII. The troops shall march out of the town with the honours of war, and be at liberty to retire whithersoever they chuse.—Ans. The troops shall march out with the honours of war; they shall march off by files to-day at four o'clock in the afternoon, and leave their arms and cannon; the armed peasants shall also leave their arms and artillery; after which the inhabitants shall retire to their houses, and those from without the town to their villages. All the individuals that have enlisted among the troops of the line four months ago, shall be free from their engagements, and retire to their villages. All the rest shall continue prisoners of war till an exchange take place, which will commence immediately between equal numbers, and rank for rank.—IX. The public debts and engagements of the state shall be faithfully and constantly discharged.—Ans. This being a political object, belongs to the cognizance of the Assembly of the Realm, and depends on the general administration.—X. Those generals who wish to continue in the capital, shall preserve their rank; and such as are desirous of quitting it, shall be at liberty so to do.—Ans. Granted: they shall remain in their station, although their pay can only continue till the kingdom receives its ultimate organization.—Additional Art. XI.—A detachment of guards shall this day, at four o'clock, take possession of the palace gates. The different gates of the city shall about the same time, be delivered up to the French army.—The guard-house of the body guards, and the general hospital, shall be surrendered to the French army at the same time.—At the same hour the park of artillery, and the arsenals, together with the engineers, shall be surrendered to the French artillery and engineers.—The works and entrenchments shall be levelled, and

the streets repaired.—The French officer about to take the command of Madrid, shall about mid-day repair, under a military guard, to the house of the principal (governor), in order to concert with government, regulations of police, and measures for the re-establishment of good order and public security in all parts of the town.—We, the undersigned Commissioners, authorised by full powers for settling and signing the present Capitulation, have agreed upon the faithful and entire execution of the above measure.—Fernando de la Vera y Pantoga—Thomas de Morla.—Alejandro.—Imperial Camp at Madrid, the 4th of December, 1808.

*Twenty-first Bulletin of the French army, dated Madrid, 19th Dec. 1808.*

His Majesty this day reviewed the army which is at Madrid, with its equipments : and civil officers, 60,000 men, 150 pieces of cannon, and more than 1500 waggons loaded with biscuit and brandy, formed an imposing appearance. The right wing of the army was supported at Chamartin, and the left stretched beyond Madrid.—The duke of Bellune is at Toledo, with his corps of the army.—The duke of Dantzig, with his corps, is at Talavera de la Reyna.—The eighth corps has reached Burgos.—General St. Cyr has made a junction, at Barcelona, with general Duhesme.—Our cavalry scours the country, to the confines of Andalusia.—The Emperor has given the army some days rest.—Excellent fortifications are completing on the heights of Madrid ; six thousand men are employed upon the works.—The small battering train, composed of 24 pounders and small mortars, is arrived.—Some fifty men have been found in the hospitals of Talavera de la Reyna ; two or three hundred saddles, and some remains of the magazines which belonged to the English troops.—Some detachments of their cavalry have appeared on the side of Valladolid. This is the first sign of their existence in this country which the English have given. They have many sick, and deserters. On the 13th of this month, their army was still at Salamanca. So splendid an armament—so strange an inactivity for the last six weeks appears most unaccountable.—His Majesty enjoys the best state of health.

*Proclamation of the Supreme Central Junta, Published at St. Mary's and Cadiz, on the 23d December.*

SPANIARDS, the hired emissaries of the

tyrant, with the design of misleading you and bringing the supreme governing Junta of the kingdom into disrepute, spread reports that the latter have approved the capitulation of Madrid. This sovereign body feel it to be their duty to contradict rumours, the object and tendency of which is to sow distrust between the government and the people, to produce general discouragement and anarchy, and to expose to contempt the sacred oath of your representatives.—Spaniards, the Supreme Junta, whose motto is, ‘Death or liberty,’ are far from approving of the capitulation of any town. That which recognises the usurper, and submits to the law of the tyrant, is not Spanish—it is an enemy. These are the sentiments of the Supreme Junta—sentiments which they will never belie, in word or deed ; and whatever you may be told by the partisans of despotism, those vile wretches who sacrifice to a miserable self-interest the sacred rights of their country, be assured that their reports are calumnies—snares laid for you by the tyrant, to entangle you in the mazes of his infernal policy. The country you have sworn to defend, the religion wherein you have sworn to die, the spouses and offspring you have sworn to protect, a captive king whom you have sworn to rescue—all demand the fulfilment of your promise.—And ye, brave inhabitants of Madrid, who refused your assent to a shameful capitulation, and rising superior to others invested with command, and even to yourselves, preferred death to misery and slavery, persevere in your generous resolution. The momentary occupation of the buildings of the city by the enemy is of no importance whilst they are not masters of your hearts. Continue to resist them in the very bosoms of your families ; place no confidence in their deceitful professions ; reflect that to every people they have promised happiness, and all they have plunged into misery. The Junta, who watch over your destiny, will cause numerous reinforcements to march to that unfortunate capital.—They have not forgotten you ; no ! keep alive your hopes, retain your bravery and firmness, and your deliverance will be the more glorious, as the danger you have encountered has been great.

*PORTUGAL.—Proclamation of the government, dated, 11 Dec. 1808.*

THE defence of the country being the first duty which honour, reason, and even nature itself, imposes on all men, when a barbarous nation, despising the most sacred

rights acknowledged in the world, aims at enslaving a country, plundering its property, destroying its religion, violating its temples, and committing the greatest atrocities that the perversity of manners and inhumanity can imagine. Portugal, unfortunately, is threatened with all these evils, and its inhabitants have no means to avoid the horrors to which they are exposed, but by having recourse to arms to repel by force the odious and wicked designs of their enemies.—We have therefore resolved, that the whole Portuguese nation shall be armed in the manner which to each inhabitant may be practicable, that all the males, without exception of person or class, shall provide themselves with a pike, 12 or 13 palms, (6 or 7 feet) in length, and such other arms as their circumstances may permit.—That all the cities, towns, and considerable villages, shall be fortified by blockading the entrances and principal streets with two, three, or more cross-beams, in order that all the inhabitants may be enabled to defend themselves vigorously when the enemy shall present himself.—That all the officers in Lisbon, and administrators of districts, shall within the space of eight days from the date of this decree, deliver in to the military governor general of their respective provinces, a list of such persons as from their activity, ability, good conduct, and the respect they are held in by the people, are qualified to take a command, always preferring in similar circumstances, those who are already military officers, and pointing out such of the said officers as by their age, incumbrances, or other circumstances, ought no longer to fill the posts they occupy.—That all the generals charged with the military government of provinces, shall divide their governments into districts, and appoint an officer of known activity and probity, whether of the troops of the line or militia, whom the chief and other officers shall obey in consequence of the said appointment, who shall visit the different villages of their district, examine the state of the several companies, and from the persons recommended to them, appoint such for officers as they shall judge deserving and capable, who shall immediately begin to exercise their companies, which shall assemble on all Sundays and saints days in their respective districts, in order to render themselves expert in the use of the arms they have, and in military evolutions: comprehending all the males from fifteen to sixty.—Lastly, we have resolved, that every person who shall not take up arms,

but refuse to concur with the nation in general, to the defence of our country, shall incur and suffer the punishment of death; and the same punishment shall await all those who shall furnish any succour or aid to the enemy, by supplying them with provisions, or assisting them in any other mode.—In like manner, any village which shall not defend itself against the assailants of the kingdom, but permit their entrance without making every possible resistance, shall be burnt and levelled with the ground.—And we hereby order all generals, military governors of provinces, the intendant-gen. of police, and all corregidors, auditors and in general all officers military and civil to aid and assist in carrying into effect the provisions of this royal decree, which shall be affixed up in all the public places, all the cities, towns, and villages of this kingdom, in order that it may be known to every inhabitant.—Approved by the council of war, who will cause it to be executed.

---

AMERICA AND FRANCE.—*Letter from Gen. Armstrong to Mr. Madison; dated, Paris, 7 Aug. 1808, enclosing a Letter to Mr. Champagny.*

It would have given me the highest pleasure to have drawn from this government, such explanations on the general subject of our differences with them, as would have met the friendly and equitable views of the United States, but I owe it as well to you as to myself, to declare, that every attempt for that purpose hitherto made, has failed, and under circumstances, which by no means indicate any change, in this respect for the better.

*The Same to the Same.*

I wrote a few lines to you yesterday. Two weeks have gone by without any new condemnation. My remonstrances continue to remain unanswered.—I enclose a copy of my note of yesterday to M. De Champagny.

*From M<sup>r</sup>. Armstrong to Mons. Champagny.*

MR. ARMSTRONG presents his compliments to M. De Champagny, and begs leave to inform him, that having, for some months past, made trial of the artificial waters of Tivoli without any useful effect, his physician has prescribed for him those of Bourbon D'Archambault. Should M. De Champagny have any communications to make to Mr. Armstrong, he will be pleased to address them, as usual, to the Hotel de Legation Americaine, rue Vanguard, 100. whence they will be regularly and promptly transmitted to Bourbon.—On leaving

Paris, Mr. Armstrong thinks proper to state his regret, that the political relations of the two powers should continue to wear an aspect less auspicious to their future good understanding, than is wished for by those who are the friends of both.—That his majesty, (Napoleon), has a right to make such municipal regulations as he may deem proper, with regard to foreign commerce, neither is nor has been denied. For example, he may forbid the entry into the ports of France of American ships which have touched in England, or been destined to England; and he may either sequester or confiscate such vessels of the United States as shall infract these laws, after due promulgation and notice thereof; but beyond this, the United States hope and believe that his majesty will not go.—M. De Champagny will not fail to seize the distinction which these remarks present, between the authority of municipal regulations and that of public law, and will decide whether it does or does not offer a ground on which a good understanding so long and so usefully maintained between the United States and France, may be preserved, and a degree of intercourse revived between, which shall have the effect of reanimating their former industry.—Does his Majesty fear that the balance of trade arising from this renewed industry, would go to the advantage of England? Means are certainly not wanting to prevent this consequence. Would it not be entirely avoided by making it a condition of the commerce in question, that all ships leaving France shall take (in some article or articles of her manufacture) the full amount of the cargo they bring hither.—Ships sailing under this regulation would or would not go voluntarily to England. If they went voluntarily, it would only be because that country afforded the best markets for the production of France, in which case, the habitual results would be entirely changed, and England ceasing to receive a balance for her manufactures, would begin to pay one to the United States, on the productions of France. Could France wish a state of commerce more prosperous than this?—If, on the other hand, the American ships did not go voluntarily to England, but were captured and sent in for adjudication, it may be fairly pre-

sumed, that the United States would no longer hesitate about becoming a party, in the war against England.—Thus, in either case, the interests of his Majesty would be directly advanced by the measure: in the one, the wants of France and her Colonies would be not only regularly supplied, but she would herself become an entrepot for the supply of the Continent: in the other, the wishes of his Majesty, as expressed in February last, would be directly promoted.

RUSSIA AND SWEDEN.—*Convention between the Russian Army and that of Sweden in Finland, dated, 18th Nov. 1803.*

By virtue of the powers vested in us, we, the undersigned, have agreed and stipulated the following Articles:—ART. I. The royal Swedish army is, immediately after the ratification of this convention, to take up a position along the frontier of the district of Uleaborg from Kemi to Peckawara. Kemi consequently remains in the hands of the Russians.—II. The Swedish army is to evacuate the town of Uleaborg within ten days next ensuing the date of this; the Russian troops are to take possession of the said town on the 30th of Nov. The other parts of the country, which are to be given up to the Russians, shall be evacuated according to the agreement yet to be concluded between the contracting parties.—III. The rear of the Swedish army shall return by the route agreed upon, and whatever cannot be removed by the Swedish troops in their retreat, shall be considered as good and lawful prize.—IV. The Swedish army binds itself neither to destroy, distribute among the inhabitants, nor sell, the magazines which they shall be necessitated to surrender.—V. The Swedish troops are not to take with them from Uleaborg or other places to be surrendered, any civil officers, nor any articles or goods belonging to the provinces.—VI. The Swedish army to send back all clergymen, civil officers, and inhabitants of the places evacuated by their troops, provided it be done by the desire, or with the consent of the said persons.—VII. This Convention shall be ratified by the respective generals in chief of both Armies, and the ratification exchanged to-morrow night.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 4.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JANUARY 28, 1809. [Price 10d.

"The Right Honble. Secretary then congratulated the House upon the temper with which *the Campaign* in that House had commenced."—Report of Mr. Canning's Speech, 19, Jan. 1809.

[97] [98] SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—The dismal news is, at last, arrived. The truth of the abused Bulletins is, at last, established to its utmost latitude. The pledge of throwing the English into the sea is, almost to the literal meaning, fulfilled. All the falsehoods of all the hired writers are, at last, completely exposed.—*My* readers, at any rate, have, from the first, been prepared for what has happened. That is now come to pass; all those truths are now apparent, which, if they had been acted upon by our ministers, would have prevented those calamities, which have now plunged the nation, the buoyed up and cheated nation, into mourning; and, for the publishing of which truths, the hirelings of the day charged me with being "instigated by the devil."—For my own part, I, who, free from the buzz of report and from the influence of other men's opinions, had taken a calm view of the Spanish nation as it was previous to the revolution; who had followed the *known* events of that revolution with an impartial eye; and who have never suffered myself to be carried away by any statements, not well-authenticated: I could never see the smallest chance of beating Napoleon in Spain, unless the *people* were let loose; unless the country were thrown into a complete state of revolution; unless all the bands of despotism were burst in sunder. From the moment that the health of "His most Catholic Majesty, Ferdinand VII." was toasted, at the London Tavern, by our Secretary of State for foreign affairs; from that moment, I clearly saw, and as clearly said, that the war was to be carried on for the interests of a faction. From that moment, I said, that the *people* would not stir; that they would be cool and indifferent spectators of the contest, and that our army, if one should be sent thither, would be very lucky not to find enemies in those, in whom they would be taught to expect the warmest of friends. How many men, how many of our unfortunate countrymen, have, since that day, had the woeful conviction of these timely

truths! How many bodies are now left to fertilize the soil of Joseph Buonaparté's kingdom, who, if my advice had been taken, would have been living for their country's defence!—If to the just anger and indignation of the people of this country, who have seen their means so wasted, their character so tarnished, their name become such a reproach amongst nations; if, to this anger and indignation, any addition could be made, it would, assuredly, be found in the slippancy, the jocularity, the gaiety, of the publications, which have been made in the Courier and the Morning Post news-papers, under the title of Speeches made by *Lord Castlereagh* and *Mr. Canning*, and of the last of which I have taken the closing sentence, by way of motto to these remarks. The authors of these publications must have known, that, in all human probability, our army, in Spain, was, at that moment, suffering every species of pain of which the mind can form an idea. When making these publications, could they have dismissed from their imaginations, the many and cruel torments into which that army had been plunged? When discussing the war in Spain, and gaily alluding to it in a figure representing the wordy wars of the House of Commons; when jocosely alluding to "the campaign," could they have forgotten that it was the campaign in Leon and Galicia? Would not men, in whose breasts only a scanty portion of mercy or compassion existed, have, upon the bare mention of the word "campaign," been carried, in idea, to the scene of anxiety, danger, fear, confusion, distress and misery, in those provinces? Would they not have seen waggons and magazines a prey to the floods and the flames, destroyed by the hands of those to whom they ought to have been a comfort and a defence? Would they not have had before their eyes, the trooper butchering the faithful sharer of his toils, when no longer able to accelerate his flight; and the poor exhausted wretch, unable to keep pace, no longer to be propped up by the assistance of his comrades, drop by the way,

following those comrades with longing eyes, eyes destined never more to behold comrade, kindred, or country? Did the pale, the woeful, the heart-piercing visage of one of these unfortunate creatures never come athwart the minds of the authors of these jocular speeches? Did they never think of the hundred and fifty miles of road strewed with stores (the fruit of English labour), with the carcasses of English horses, and the bodies of Englishmen, perishing from wounds, fatigue, or hunger?—But, while Rome burnt, Nero *fiddled*; the bloody head of John the Baptist was presented to a damsel at a *dance*; and it is universally true, that the Monkey and the Tyger meet in the same mind, or, in other words, that the most complete want of feeling is inseparable from levity, a maxim more emphatically expressed by our great poet, when he says, that “a man may smile and smile and be a villain.”—Now, mark me, reader; I do not pretend to ascribe these speeches, such as I have found them in the newspapers above-mentioned, to Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning. All the exceptionable parts of them may, for aught I know, have been foisted in by the reporters. I find them printed and published; and, as printed publications, I express my abhorrence of their unfeeling contents, which, at a moment like that when these publications were made, when, besides the general fear and sorrow that prevailed, there must have been two or three hundred thousand individuals in this kingdom half frantic with anxiety for the personal safety of their kindred and friends, were an insult to public opinion and feeling of which, I hope, no one but the authors of these publications could possibly have been guilty.—The reported debates in parliament, upon the subject of the Spanish Revolution, present us with very little that is new. The only excuse for not anticipating Napoleon is, that, until October, the Central Junta was not established; and that, before it was established, it would not have been prudent to send an army into Spain. Now, the public will recollect, that the Convention of Cintra, which took place in *August*, was justified upon the ground, that any sacrifice ought to be made, *in order to hasten the march of our army into Spain*; and, Sir Hew Dalrymple says this in his dispatch, where he speaks also of the vast importance of getting possession of the passes of the Pyrenees before the French army should arrive. Sir Hew Dalrymple

would hardly have talked in this way to a ministry, who had given him no authority to march into Spain; and this, observe, was on the *22nd of August*. But, be this as it may; whether or not, the ministers knew it to be imprudent to send an army into Spain, until the Central Junta was established, their conduct still retains its blameable character; for, when the delay had continued so long, *they should have known*, that it was *too late* to send an army into Spain. It was their business to know this. We pay Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning *six thousand pounds a year each*, besides numerous thousands to their relations, for attending to such matters; to obtain and make use of such knowledge; and, for them now to tell us, that they fear no censure, that they do not look upon themselves as culprits, because they have done *their best*, is something that, in better times, would not be borne with patience. Nations whose affairs are well-managed, do not pay any man 6,000 pounds a year for doing *his best*. Where they pay such a sum, in the way of salary, they expect, and demand, corresponding services. For persons, in such situations, to commit blunders is to commit crimes. What responsibility is there, or can there be, if the accused is to be acquitted upon the plea of having *meant well*? Sir Robert Calder, who, with an inferior force, beat the enemy, and captured two of his ships, was disgraced upon the express ground of an *error in judgment*. And shall no disgrace attend those, who, having all the means of the country, and all the means of correct information, in their hands, planned the campaign of Leon and Galicia; where an army, one of the largest ever sent from England, had no chance of safety but in flight; where, to save *a part* from being captured, the rest were compelled to expose themselves to inevitable destruction?—From what was said, in the debates, about waiting for the formation of a Central Junta, it appears evident enough, I think, that we shall be found to have been at the bottom of the scheme of a war for Ferdinand VII, “His Most Catholic Majesty,” who offered to marry one of Buonaparte’s relations. Of this bright scheme it will, I am fully persuaded, finally appear, that we were the authors. This is a point of vast importance. Of much more importance than all the rest; because upon it turns the question, *for what we are expending all this blood and treasure*. Mr. Robinson (I wonder who he is) that moved the Address, in answer

to the Speech from the throne, threw out some hints, that there *might* be certain persons, who wished us not to assist the Spaniards, unless they first resolved to change their government. I was one of those persons; and my wish was founded upon these two reasons; first, because it was sheer folly to suppose, that those, who were content with the old order of things, without any reform of corruptions and abuses, would ever fight manfully against Napoleon; would ever succeed in resisting his dukes and his legions: and, second, because, for the sake of the Spaniards themselves, and for the sake of other nations, and England in particular, it was not desirable that they should succeed, if such were their object. I have, all along, expressed this opinion; and, if it had been entertained by the ministers, we should not now have to mourn over the sufferings and death of so many valuable men. It was notorious; it was a fact known to every man, of any information, in all Europe, that the Spaniards were so degraded by their government, that they had none of the feelings of a people left in them. What was to be expected from such a population, unless some *grand convolution* could have been effected? Such a community, if it be worthy of the name, must be turned up-side-down; must be shook to pieces and new moulded, before any thing like military exertion can be reasonably expected from it. This work of renovation was, *by the help of the press*, going on, till the Central Junta was formed, and began to preach up tranquillity and put a stop to “*licentious publications*.<sup>1</sup>” After this we heard no more of “*a reform of abuses*,” and of “*the late infamous government*.<sup>2</sup>” Nothing now was to be heard but of “our lord and sovereign Don Ferdinand the VII.” and of sober lectures, not unaccompanied with dreadful denunciations, issued in his name. These had no effect; or an effect the contrary of what they were intended to produce. Read the proclamations, the terrific menaces of Romana and Palafox, and then believe, if you can, that the *people* of Spain were enthusiastic in the cause of “His Catholic Majesty Ferdinand VII.” Men, whom, to draw out in defence of their country, it is necessary to threaten with the gallows, cannot, I think, be looked upon as very enthusiastic in its cause. The numerous falsehoods of our news-papers, respecting the dispositions of the Spanish people, can no longer be disguised. Every officer, every soldier, who returns, will have his

dismal tale to tell. I shall, probably, see none of them; but, many of my readers will; and to them I leave the decision upon the correctness, or incorrectness of my opinions, which, to say the truth, were entertained by every *politician* that I have ever conversed with upon the subject.—These opinions I expressed to an officer of great merit and sense, just before his departure; and, if he has lived out the campaign, he will, I am sure, have had thousands of opportunities of witnessing the truth of what I said.—It was impossible; it was not in nature, that such a people should be roused to battle by such means. Buonaparté now laughs at our folly in supposing the thing possible, in engaging in such a wild scheme. Well he may. And why did not our ministers know this before? Why did they not tender to the people of Spain those things which Buonaparté has tendered to them? It is false; grossly false, to say that the Spanish nation did not wish to be freed from oppression. We never made them the offer. We never encouraged them to break their chains. We took part with the adherents of one branch of the late royal family; we royalized the cause of Spain; we made it a contest between king Ferdinand and king Joseph; we fought for a king and an aristocracy, whom the people knew, against one whom they knew not, and who, at any rate, promised them better days than they, or even their fathers, ever saw.—This has been our conduct, and this conduct has led to failure, accompanied with every possible circumstance of national mortification and disgrace. This, therefore, ought to be the first object of inquiry; but, as the public will see, it will never be an object of inquiry at all.—Let us now look, a little, at the dismal close of the campaign. I believe, that our soldiers behaved well before Corunna; I have no doubt that they did, and that they beat equal numbers opposed to them; but, I cannot agree with General Hope, in calling it a “*victory*;” and, I do beseech the public not to give way to any *boasting* upon the subject. Our army *fought for their lives*, let it be remembered. All that were not killed may be said to have *escaped*. Under such circumstances, to talk of a “*victory*” is to make a quite new application of the word, and, upon other occasions, to render its meaning dubious.—Of poor General Moore, the end, at any rate, was becoming. The enemy had him at bay; but, there he shewed himself to be a brave man; he did not, as *generals*

*some times have done*, make a disgraceful capitulation, and slink home himself to be the bearer of the news, leaving the wretched companions of his flight exposed to danger and hardship. He, at any rate, saved, by his valour, the remnant of his naked and famishing and lacerated army; to the disgrace of flight, he did not add that of base capitulation. Rather than do this, he bravely met almost certain death; and, therefore, whatever might be the errors of his conduct during the campaign, his fall will be deeply and universally regretted, and his memory held in honour. Great praise is, on this account, due to Generals Baird and Hope; because it is certain, that if any one of them had, *as some others have done*, shunned personal danger, the far greater part of the remains of our army would have gone to a French prison, instead of coming to England.— It is impossible to form an idea of a state of existence more painful than that of poor General Moore must have been for the last six weeks. He found himself unsupported by the people of Spain; he saw the Spanish levies, at the approach of the French, melt away like new-fallen snow before an April sun; and, yet, hearing the English news-papers continually vomiting forth the numbers and the enthusiasm of “the noble and valiant” people of Spain; the glorious efforts of the “universal Spanish nation”; hearing this, and knowing well how easily the faults of ministers are thrown upon commanders, he must naturally have dreaded a return to England without *doing something*. That something he attempted, and hence all his and his army’s calamities.—But, shall we not be informed of the purport of the orders that were given him from home? Shall we not know, whether he was ordered to advance, when he was about to retreat? I doubt it. The nation seems to be dead. There is no spirit remaining in it. If there had been, indeed, this great calamity never would have happened. The scene exhibited at Portsmouth, this very day, where officers have been carried on shore, one after another, upon hammocks; where the hospitals are crowded with the sick and wounded, and where, such is the condition in which the poor wretches of soldiers are, that it can scarcely be distinguished to what corps they belong; such scenes would, one would think, fill the people with indignation against the authors of all this misery and disgrace. But, no: like

Jews, we confine our feelings merely to sorrow; we are become a *crying nation*. A poor, spiritless, cowed-down, abject race. Cry! The time was when Englishmen would have cursed as well as cried. So do they now, indeed, in *secret*; but not one man, who has the power to enforce his demands; not one man of this description, will openly call for redress.—The public will remember (but will not resent, or profit from) the train of lies, which has been dealt out to them, from time to time, since the commencement of the war in Spain. Forget them, however, they cannot. They cannot have, already at least, forgotten how flatly the statements of the French bulletins were contradicted; and how greedily they gave into the contradiction. From lie to lie we have been led on, until, at last, we see the remnant of our fleecing and perishing army land upon our shores. It is only four days since the Courier news-paper told us, and, apparently, under high authority, that our army had reached Corunna in *safety*; that the Spaniards had defeated Joseph Buonaparté, killing 15,000 of his men; and that the Duke de l’Infantado was in pursuit of Buonaparté. Now; now, when the half-dead remnant of the army has actually arrived to tell its own tale; now the lie of the day is of a new sort. Now the *numbers* are nothing like what they were thought to be. Once our army in Spain was 45,000 strong; when the first retreat was sounded, it fell to 35,000; when the dispatches of Sir John Moore came from Benevente, it came down to 28,000; and now (oh, the infamous liars!) they have brought it so low as 24,000, and the Courier, who only backs a brother liar, says, that “*it is said* our army, in Spain, never ‘consisted of more than 24 thousand men. ‘We thought it had been stronger.’” Aye, or else you deserve to be kicked back all the way to John a Grote’s house; for you, scores of times, positively stated it at above 40 thousand. The scheme now is, however, to lessen the numbers as much as possible, and for more than one motive too evident to mention. But, if there were a member of parliament, who would call for the detailed Returns of the corps sent to Portugal and Spain, we should soon see this scheme blown into the air. In the mean while, we *know*, that there were 35 thousand men in Portugal, at the time when the Wellesley Armistice was signed; we knew that 10 thousand men went out with Gen. Baird; that makes the amount 45 thousand men, exclusive of those, since

gone out under General Cradock, and, still more recently, under another General, whose name I have forgotten. Well, now; what is become of the *forty five* thousand men? How many of them remained in Portugal? Let us but know that, and also how many have escaped, through Corunna and Vigo, and then we shall know how many have perished in Lord Castlereagh's Campaign. This is the proper object of inquiry. What is the use of declamatory speeches? Let us have some *jacts*, and leave us to judge for ourselves. Let us have a Return of the killed, wounded, and missing, from the time that the regiments *left England*. That is what I want to see; but, it is what we never shall have. By one of our bulletins, published on Saturday last, the credulous public were informed, that "it was apprehended, that a sacrifice of *some* horses, baggage, and stores, would be unavoidable, but there was *no doubt* that *nearly the whole* of the troops would be got off;" leaving that word *whole* to be applied to the army as it entered Spain. "Some horses," indeed! *How many* will come back in all? Buonaparté, who, when he sent off his last bulletin, had pursued our army as far as Astorga, says that "the road was strewed with dead horses belonging to the English, with travelling carriages, with artillery, with covered waggons, and warlike stores." He says, that he found, at Astorga, magazines of sheets and blankets and pioneering implements; that the Duke of Dalmatia found 2,000 sick in Leon, either of Romana's or our army; that we burnt immense magazines at Benevente; and, that, upon the road between Benevente and Astorga, a distance of about 20 miles out of from 150 to 200, he picked up two hundred waggons of baggage and ammunition. And yet we are told, in one of our government bulletins, that "it was apprehended, that a sacrifice of *some* horses, baggage, and stores *would be unavoidable!*" The public will not believe these bulletins again; but, as a cover for its baseness in not shewing its resentment, it will pretend to believe them, and to believe, too, all that is now said about the small original amount of our army. Nothing is easier than to ascertain the amount of our loss, in every way. Let some one call for the returns, from every department, of what was sent out, placing the *cost* against each article. This, indeed, would be fit and useful employment for "a guardian of the public purse." Declamation, and even reasoning, are, in such cases, a waste of words and

time. Facts speak for themselves, and carry conviction not to be shaken.—Amongst other Returns, which this burthened public ought to be made acquainted with, is that of the *Deserters*; especially as we read, in all the news-papers, that the Emperor Napoleon says, that "all the *Germans*, in the pay of the English, are *deserting*." The cost of the "*Foreign Corps*," last year, is stated in the public accounts, to be more than *one fifth* of the cost of *the whole of the British regular army*; and it, surely, becomes the "guardians of the public purse," to ascertain, whether troops, maintained at so enormous an expence, have deserted, as the Emperor of France, in the face of his army and of the world, declares they have. If the fact be true, it is of great importance to us, that some measure should be taken in consequence of it, not only in a pecuniary point of view, but as the example may operate upon our own army; and, if it be false, justice to these foreigners demands an unequivocal and speedy contradiction of the Emperor's assertions. But, it must be observed before hand, that assertion, unsupported by *proof*, and the very best proof that the case admits of, will not satisfy the world, and ought not to satisfy any man. The Emperor's assertion *may* be false; it may be totally groundless, though it is not very easy to conceive a reason for his publishing such a falsehood; but, at any rate, the assertion has been made, and the truth, or falsehood, should be ascertained by detailed returns and reports. It is quite in vain to abuse Napoleon, to call him a liar and a calumniator. He has made a distinct assertion, of which assertion we have it completely in our power to *ascertain* the truth, or the falsehood; and, if we, or rather, the parliament, decline doing it, the world will be at no loss what to believe upon the subject.—There is another assertion in the bulletins well worthy of formal and authentic contradiction. We were informed, that *General Stewart*, a brother of Lord Castlereagh, when the horse under his command took Gen. Lefebvre, was *greatly*, nay, *four or five to one*, *inferior* to the French in point of *amount of force*. Now, let us hear what the emperor has said upon this affair. "The English had reported throughout the country that they had defeated 5000 of the French cavalry on the banks of the Ezela, and that the field of battle was covered with their dead. The inhabitants of Benavente were much surprised upon visiting the

" field of battle, to have found there only  
" three Englishmen and two French.  
" That contest of 400 men against 2000,  
" does great honour to the French. During  
" the whole of the 29th, the river con-  
" tinued to swell considerably, so that at  
" the close of the evening it became im-  
" possible to ford it. It was in the mid-  
" dle of the river, and at the moment he  
" was on the point of being drowned, that  
" General Lefebvre, being carried away  
" by the current to the side occupied by  
" the English, was made prisoner."—

Which are we to believe? "Our own  
" story," to be sure, say the "loyal;"  
but which will the world believe? It is  
easy for us, however, to get at some *proof*  
upon the point; and we ought to do it;  
for, if we do not, we may be sure, that the  
opinions of mankind will, at best, be di-  
vided.—As intimately connected with  
this, the following paragraph, from the  
Courier of the 24th instant, is worthy of  
being put upon record. "It appears that  
" Buonaparté ceased superintending in  
" person the operations against us, after  
" the arrival of the French army at Astorga,  
" on the 2d. He says in his last bulletin,  
" dated Astorga, that he left the charge of  
" pursuing us to the point of embarkation, to  
" the duke of Dalmatia.—Probably he had  
" received information that rendered it ne-  
" cessary for him to return to Madrid, though  
" we fear the report transmitted to Govern-  
" ment, of the French having been driven  
" from the Capital, is unfounded. There is  
" an account circulated UPON GOOD  
" AUTHORITY that Buonaparté was,  
" at one time, in a situation of some peril.  
" When Gen. Lefebvre was taken prison-  
er, Buonaparté was himself on a height  
" on the other side of the river, about two  
" miles from the scene of action. Gen.  
" Stewart was apprised of the circum-  
" stance, and had he not been RESTRAIN-  
" ED by the POSITIVE orders which he had  
" previously received, he would have en-  
" deavoured to have got in the rear of  
" Buonaparté, and have made a dash at  
" him. His orders, however, being positive,  
" and the risk considerable, he did not  
" think it proper to make the attempt."  
Now, what is the "good authority," upon  
which this Bobadilian story rests? It is  
evident, that no authority, with regard to  
what General Stewart thought about it, can  
be good, unless it come from Gen. Stewart  
himself; and, the inevitable conclusion is,  
that the General has himself spread this  
vain-glorious, this Bully-Bluff-like report;  
or, which one must hope to be the case,

the editor of the Courier has, here again,  
as it were to mock the grief of the nation,  
promulgated an empty boasting falsehood.

—Hundreds and thousands of stories, of  
this stamp, will, however, now be resorted  
to, with a view of amusing the public  
mind, of drawing it off from contemplating  
the loss, the misery and the disgrace, the  
numberless *national* disgraces, of this cam-  
paign. But, when we see the remnant of  
the army tumbling, helter-skelter, on  
board the first vessel they can reach; when we see the balls and bomb-shells  
falling thick as hail-stones around and  
amongst the fugitive ships; when we see  
the poor creatures, who have finally es-  
caped, who have survived this complica-  
tion of dangers and of miseries, creeping  
to our shores, one after another, in a state  
worse than that of mariners after ship-  
wreck; when we see all this, when we  
actually, with our own eyes, behold the  
half-naked, emaciated, ghost-looking, re-  
mains of our once stout, well equipped,  
and gaily-dressed army, is it possible that  
we can be such senseless animals, such  
brute beasts, as to give into a train of  
boasting about "*victories and laurels?*"  
Oh! this is not the way to recover our  
character. This is not the way to prevent  
such calamities in future. It is a deep  
sense of our loss, and our national disgrace,  
that should now have possession of our  
minds; never, for one moment, losing  
sight of that important truth, of which  
every soul in our unfortunate army has now  
had such woeful experience, that, to induce  
a people to rise in arms against a powerful  
invader, they must first, not be *told*, but  
made to *feel*, THAT THEY HAVE  
SOMETHING TO FIGHT FOR.

WEST INDIA DOCKS.—Merely as a *com-  
mercial* matter, I should not have been dis-  
posed to bestow much attention upon this  
subject; but, as bringing to light some  
most interesting facts, connected with the  
cause of morality, it is of very great pub-  
lic importance.—From a Report of a  
Committee of the Dock Company, which  
Report will be found in another part of  
this double number, the public will see of  
what immense advantage this establish-  
ment has been, in a commercial point of  
view; and, from what I am now about to  
state, they will see, that it has been of a  
still greater advantage in the cutting off of  
the means of robbery.—The book pub-  
lished some years ago by one of the police  
magistrates, was not necessary to con-  
vince me, or any other person, who had

had but the smallest transactions in the way of shipping or receiving merchandize, that the thieves upon the waters bore the same proportion as to land thieves, that the fish do to terrestrial creatures. All appeared to be thievery and plunder; and, it is a fact well-known amongst merchants, that thousands upon thousands of persons lived upon, and openly gloried in, this plunder, part of which came out of the revenue, but the far greater part out of the pockets of individuals. So bold were the persons who carried on this trade of thieving, that a remonstrance was very lucky if it did not produce some act of violence upon the person making it. I myself have seen women carrying away sugar and coffee, in their aprons, and drawing off the molasses into mugs, in open day-light. But, these petty thefts, though their flagrancy clearly enough shows how little care was taken of the property of the West India merchant and planter, sink out of sight when compared with acts such as that of which I am now about to speak, and which I give, not as any thing rare, but by way of pretty fair specimen.—A ship arrived from the West Indies; and being entered, what is called a master *Lumper* was, in the usual way, engaged to discharge the cargo for about thirty guineas. He accordingly proceeded in doing that duty for nearly a month, when the owner was informed by one of the sailors, that the Lumpers continued working during the nights, as well as the days; and that he had heard the master-Lumper say to the Captain, that, as he must be a good deal fatigued, he had better go to sleep; that something should be put under his pillow to make him rest comfortably; and that the sum mentioned between them was two hundred guineas. The Lumper also engaged to take care of the revenue officers, in order that he (the captain) should not be disturbed. This being agreed upon, the master-Lumper came on board with his people (a fine gang of thieves!), about eleven o'clock at night, and, going seriously to work with bags and boats, and continuing the practice for eight or ten nights before the owner was informed of it, was supposed, in the course of that time, to have carried off about *twenty tons* of sugar, together with a proportion of other things. The merchant, upon being informed of the matter, went on board with a friend, accused the captain of having countenanced these villainous proceedings, and having taken him by surprize, he could not deny the fact, but pretended, that he was not

aware of the extent to which they had been carried. The merchant, however, was so fully convinced of his guilt, that he lodged an information against him, and sent a constable to apprehend him. The constable was so unfortunate as to miss the rogue, which is almost always the case in that region of theft and plunder. The Captain absconded, and, as to a country of congenial manners and morals; as to a home pointed out by instinct, he, as has since appeared, immediately fled to the American States.—Now, estimating the value of the sugar stolen upon this occasion, at the present gazetted price, the amount of loss, upon this one cargo, would be £1,580, or, enough to maintain thirty thieves, for a year, at the rate of twenty shillings a week for each.—This may be thought an extreme case, and, I am willing so to suppose it; but, as to the amount of the goods stolen, we must consider, that the plunder was in the article of sugar, not so portable and far less valuable than several other West India productions, in the first stage of the operations on ship-board. It must be recollectcd, that vessels were usually from three to six weeks, and, sometimes, two or three months, unlading their cargoes; that it was no unusual circumstance for goods to remain a like period in lighters on the water. During all this time the pillage must have been going on, the only protection being the honesty, or moderation, of the lightermen and river-watchmen, on whom there was no check, the goods not being weighed till landed on the quays. Here the duty and the ship-owner's charge for freight were ascertained and secured; but, the unfortunate West India planter (whom I cannot help regarding as the most ill-treated of mankind) was afterwards exposed to the malpractices of porters, carmen, warehouse-men, and ship-coopers, with the additional mortification of knowing, that, to the loss of his goods, he had now to add the amount of duty, freight, and all other charges, some of which made by these numerous licensed-thieves for having taken care of what they had stolen. It was a rule at the free quays, that the Wharfinger should not be chargeable with any loss of weight, after weighing to ascertain the amount of the duty, unless that loss exceeded 28 pounds on a hogshead, even during twenty-four hours. There needs nothing more than a bare knowledge of this fact to shew to what extent the plunder upon the proprietor was carried, and with what impunity it existed. No wonder

that tribes of petty plunderers were seen, as I have frequently seen them, carrying often sugar and coffee from the quays in open day, and without any apparent apprehension of the consequences. There is little doubt that they purchased, in one way or another, permission thus to depredate upon the West India planter. There was something shockingly unjust, too, in first weighing the article to ascertain the duty; laying on that duty; and, after that not being answerable for the full weight to the owner of the goods. First the government took the goods out of his possession into theirs to ascertain the weight of them, in order to lay a tax thereon; and then they refused to be responsible, that *their own people* should not steal from him the goods, for which they had made him pay that tax.—As to the total amount of these abominable robberies, a gentleman, long conversant in the West India trade, has stated, in a letter, which has been shewn to me, that he took the sales of *several* parcels of sugar of the same marks, from the same estates, and, of course, the hogsheads were made by the same coopers, shipped from Jamaica by the same convoy. He compared the *London* sales with the sales at the *out-ports*, and he found the average difference of net weight to be  $46\frac{1}{4}$  pounds upon each hogshead; which, of course, was the weight of what was stolen by the nest of villains upon and near the *Thames*. According to this gentleman's calculation, the annual loss on sugar, rum, coffee, and other West India commodities, in consequence of this deep-rooted system of plunder, amounted, before the Dock establishment existed, on an average to between *three and four hundred thousand pounds*; enough to maintain *eight thousand thieves* at the rate of *fifty pounds* a year for each thief. Dispose of the plunder how you please; send it through whatever channels; make what distribution you like; the result will finally be, that, owing to this system, eight thousand of the people of this country were maintained, were kept stewed up in London, living upon the fruit of theft, at a rate twice as high as common agricultural labourers are paid. What a shameful, what a disgraceful, what an infamous thing to be notoriously existing in a country, boasting of its laws and its morals! —That which could put a stop to these practices; that which could effectually cut off this source of livelihood to cheats and thieves, may, with propriety, be called an institution “*for the Suppression of Vice;*”

and such the West India Dock Company really appears to be. The system they have adopted is this: The ship's hold is, by law, secured by locks on her arrival at Gravesend, and no access is permitted to her cargo, till she is brought into the quay to unload. On reaching the Docks, she is admitted into the import Basin, where no person is allowed to remain on board during the night. The time requisite to unload an entire cargo is from six to ten or twelve days, according to the size of the ship. Immediately on being landed, the goods are weighed and lodged in the warehouses. No watchmen are employed, except as general guards, on the out-side of the walls. The entrances to the works and warehouses are strictly watched, and suspicious persons are subjected to examination; and, in short, if frauds or thefts are attempted, the difficulties in carrying off the booty, or of escaping detection, are too great to leave the smallest chance of being surmounted.—It is said, that there are persons, who cavil against this establishment; and where is the wonder, when we find, that, first or last, it must throw *eight thousand* persons out of bread, or compel them to earn the bread they eat, not by the slight of hand, but by the sweat of their brow? Only think of the machinations of such a phalanx of thieves! Only think of such a swarm of wasps and hornets, driven, all at once, from the sugar and molasses hogsheads on the king's quays! Oh! there is another swarm, who draw in their sustenance more circuitously, whose proboscises as well as whose stings are of greater length, and, of course, whose depredations and oppressions are more generally felt. Would to God that some “Society for the *Suppression of Vice,*” would take these in hand! —I will answer, now, that these eight thousand of ousted thieves are all found to be full of professions of “*loyalty;*” and that they accuse the Dock Company of something very nearly bordering upon Jacobinism. Nay, they are certainly “*innovators;*” that cannot be denied. They have broken in upon the “*established order of things;*” they have, in a most cunning manner, undermined the “*privileged orders;*” they have made a “*revolution;*” and are downright “*levellers;*” seeing that their great maxim is, that no man, be his post, or badge of honour, what it may, shall have any of their sugar, rum, or coffee, without first rendering them the worth of it, either in *money*, or in *services.*”—This subject, however, merits a view still

more extensive, and, of course, more worthy of general attention and consideration.—What has been the *cause*, the great primary cause, of all this scandalous plunder? What is it that has rendered necessary the Dock Establishment, with all its cares and all its immense expences? Simply this: *the taxes upon West India productions*. In order to collect these taxes, the government was obliged to take the goods out of the hands of their proprietor, who, if left himself in possession of them, would have wanted no one to assist; nothing but the common law of the land, to assist him in the guarding of them. Wheat and other grain, scarcely less valuable in price, compared with the weight, than sugar and coffee, and still more necessary to man's subsistence, lie very quietly in places which a thief might, at any time, force in a moment. In frail buildings often at the distance of a mile from any inhabited dwelling. It is very seldom, compared to the number of barns and mills, that we hear of a theft in these commodities. And what is their protection? The knowledge, that they are *under the guardianship of the proprietor*. If they, too, were subjected to a transfer of possession, like that which takes place in the case of sugar, we should see exactly the same plundering going on with respect to them. By this transfer property loses its sacredness; it does not *belong* unto him who *has* it. To know this is quite sufficient to dissipate the idea of proprietorship, and to let loose a disposition to plunder. In vain do you impose oaths, form checks, set watches ten deep; nothing will, or can, prevent goods, in this situation, from being stolen. The Dock Company have, doubtless, done much; but, I defy even their walls, the very existence of which constitutes so damning a proof of prevalent dishonesty; I defy even their walls, and I would defy ramparts and cannons, if they had them, to prevent thieving, as long as it is known, that he who has the *possession* is not the *proprietor*, or, which is the same thing, the agent chosen by the proprietor. It is a pleasing reflection, that crimes have been diminished; that hordes of the vilest of thieves have been broken up; that there will exist less temptation; that eight thousand less persons will leave their honest and productive labour in the country to go and share in the plunder upon the Thames; but, in a greater or less degree, as long as the tax exists, and is collected in such a way, so long will it continue to engender idleness

and thieving, and to spread its baleful influence over the land. The moment the lock is put upon the hold of the ship, at Gravesend, that moment the contents change their nature. The government becomes the possessor of them; and the unreflecting and unmoralized mind will, in spite of all you can do, regard them as an object of plunder. It is no longer an affair between man and man. From depredations of this sort; from becoming familiar with taking *what is not their own* in any situation, men naturally lose the horror of taking the property of their neighbour; and hence it is, and must be, the case, that a nation, in proportion as taxation, in the custom-house way, prevails, will be dishonest.—And, after all, who is it that finally suffer for this thieving? The consumers of West India produce; those who finally pay the taxes upon it. The planters occasionally suffer, because the thieving must fall partially; but it is those who consume that suffer in the end; and, when we sit down to the use of sugar or coffee, we may always say, that we are contributing towards the support of thieves; that, in earning the money to buy our breakfast, we have been labouring towards the maintenance of eight thousand thieves in London. And, if we can now say, that our earnings no longer go to the support of this horde of thieves, badged and unbadged, we cannot help remembering, that the expences of the Dock Establishment must fall upon our breakfasts; though, it must, on all hands, be confessed, that it is better to pay for the prevention, than for the encouragement, of theft.—In this view of the matter, without being dazzled by its stupendous mercantile exhibitions, and reserving, to their full extent, all my opinions, relating to the inutility of commerce, as a source of national wealth or strength, I cannot help expressing my pleasure at the establishment of the West India Dock system, and my hopes that it will proceed with uninterrupted success, in spite of the out-cries of eight thousand thieves and their interested abettors.

*Botley, 26th January, 1809.*

---

COBBETT'S  
COMPLETE COLLECTION OF  
State Trials:

To be completed in Thirty-Six Monthly Parts, forming Twelve large Volumes in Royal Octavo,

The SECOND PART of the above Work will be published on Wednesday, the 1st day of February.

## WEST INDIA DOCKS.

AT A GENERAL COURT OF PROPRIETORS OF THE WEST-INDIA DOCK COMPANY, HELD AT THEIR HOUSE IN BILLITRE-SQUARE, ON FRIDAY THE 6TH OF JANUARY, 1809, THOMAS HUGHAN, Esq. IN THE CHAIR; THE CHAIRMAN READ TO THE MEETING A REPORT FROM A COMMITTEE OF DIRECTORS, ON THE GENERAL CONDUCT OF THE COMPANY'S CONCERNs, TO THE END OF THE YEAR 1808; WHICH WAS ORDERED TO BE PRINTED FOR THE USE OF THE PROPRIETORS.

**REPORT.**—*The Committee of Review, in compliance with the Resolution of the Court of Directors of the 20th December last, directing that they should “ Report to the “ Court the present state of business at the “ Docks, and such circumstances respecting “ the Company’s Concerns during the last “ Season, as may appear to them to require “ observation,” present the following Report.*

THE season just elapsed having been one of peculiar difficulty in the conduct of the Company's concerns, and in which the efficacy and resources of the Establishment have been called into action, and put to the test, it is matter of singular gratification to your Committee to be enabled to state, that the exertions of your officers and servants have been successful in the discharge of their duty; and that the business of the year, in all its various departments, although impeded by circumstances embarrassing and unprecedented, has been completed at a period unusually early. To the details which are necessarily connected with this (the more immediate) object of your Committee, they premise a few remarks, founded upon those facts and incontrovertible principles to which your Establishment owes both its origin and its utility.—However unwilling some persons may be to awaken the recollection, yet it cannot be generally forgotten, what were the excessive delays, increasing difficulties, and glaring abuses, which not many years ago obstructed, in an especial manner, the West-India Trade at this port, and called aloud for a remedy. The records exist which prove the enormity of the evil, progressively affecting the credit of the port, the safe collection of the revenue, and the property of individuals connected with the trade, in times otherwise prosperous, and seriously contributing to degrade and corrupt the morals of the people. To these causes your Establishment owes its origin; an effectual reform could only be sought in a great and costly effort. The individuals who formed and who composed the Company, undertook, at very considerable risk, to make the effort requisite for a pur-

pose so desirable.—The obstacles that must occur in combating numerous and powerful classes of opponents determined by prejudice, or stimulated by interest, could only be surmounted by that union of zeal, perseverance, and ability, which were on this occasion combined, and being sanctioned by a provident policy in the legislature, (fortunately for the commercial prosperity of London,) proved successful. These opponents although silenced were not reconciled. To the origin and character of the Establishment itself, as opposed to individual and petty exactions, may be traced the source of much of that spirit of discontent and hostility which it has since encountered, and which has pursued its object, by misrepresentations, most gross, and yet too frequently credited; but it is a rigid enquiry into their conduct, and an impartial investigation of their principles and proceedings, that will furnish to the Company the surest means of vindicating themselves, and demonstrating, that they have, in all liberal construction, accomplished the good purposes of the undertaking, and fulfilled their engagements to the public.—By the general view of its merits and demerits, and not by its adaptation to any one particular occurrence, ought every public Establishment in fairness to be tried; but your Committee are confident that the Company need not shrink from a more minute scrutiny, and enquiry, how far its provisions and regulations are already compatible with the separate and distinct interests of different bodies connected with the West-India trade; although they may and will on the test of experiment, and by suggestions of those most interested, be ultimately still farther perfected.—The security afforded to property, and the prevention of frauds, are purposes which your institution is universally admitted to have attained, and in these objects, the interests of the public revenue, of the importers and proprietors of goods, and of the ship owners, are all intimately blended, and most essentially promoted; and yet these topics, of the highest importance to the state, and to individuals, (when clamour is to be excited against your system), are seldom adverted to, and although it would be no difficult task to prove that the duty saved to the revenue, and the property preserved to individuals, by these means, amounts annually to many hundred thousand pounds, yet your Committee abstain from a superfluous illustration of a fact so generally acknowledged, and proceed to details which are

more connected with some late discussions concerning the conduct of your Establishment.—If the Warehousing System be productive of great practical benefit both to internal and foreign commerce, it must not be overlooked, that so far as the West-India trade is concerned, it could not have been carried into effect, without some Establishment equivalent to that which thus originated. It is well known that during many years of his administration, the advantages that might result from that system both to the revenue and to the trade, had presented themselves to the comprehensive mind of that able minister, the late Mr. Pitt, and that he only suspended its adoption, until some adequate improvement should be made in the Port of London, under which it might be safely carried into effect. Your Establishment had hardly begun its operation before the provisions of that system were enacted by the legislature, the advantages of which, great as they are, have been necessarily attended by some additional delay and embarrassment to business, which the Company has endeavoured to meet with promptitude, and with the requisite additions to their Establishment.—The benefits accruing to the West-India body generally, and the degree of accommodation and dispatch afforded by the Company, your Committee conceive will be best illustrated by a few concise statements, as they are desirous that on disputed points an appeal may be made solely to the evidence of facts. They will here premise, that whatever advantages it shall appear have been obtained for the trade, are secured to it without any additional expence being incurred; the Company on its formation having undertaken for the term of their charter, to provide all the accommodation which the Dock System affords, and to perform all the services and labour necessary to ships and goods at importation, for the charges then current at the port, although such charges had been previously and almost annually advancing.—In order to shew how far the means and resources of the Company have been properly applied, and the dispatch given to ships, your Committee will first call the attention of the Court to an account, shewing the number of ships employed in the West-India trade which have been discharged in the Docks in the last six years, with the dates at which the business of each season appears to have been respectively completed.

Year.	No. of Ships.	Finished Landing.
1803	363	14 Jan. 1804
1804	354	29 Dec. 1804
1805	421	22 Jan. 1806
1806	477	2 Feb. 1807
1807	503	24 Dec. 1807
1808	598	593 completed 3 Dec. 1808

by which it will appear, that such has been the increase of the West-India trade, that 95 ships have been unloaded this season in addition to the greatest number ever before received, and 174 ships more than the average number of the preceding five years. In the period between the beginning of July and the beginning of December, a space of five months, when circumstances of the greatest difficulty occurred, upwards of 460 ships were unloaded, exclusive of smaller vessels and craft, with cargoes consisting of 159,804 hhds. and trs. of Sugar.—26,917 puns. and hhds., Rum.—31,675 hhds. and trs., 125,480 bags, Coffee.—10,855 bales, 487 pockets, &c. Cotton.—35 casks, 2732 bags, Pimento.—351 casks, 2,411 bags, Ginger.—822 casks, 7,228 bags, Cocoa.—1,797 casks, Wine.—Making a total of 11,342 bales, 137,851 bags, 221,401 casks, and from the 10th Oct. to the 28th Nov. 150 ships were entirely unloaded at the quays. This being the precise period when it was stated to the lords of the treasury, that owing to the negligence of the directors, only 8 or 9 ships were at that time unloaded weekly, and proceeding on that calculation, that 108 ships then in the docks would necessarily be delayed some months, (we must presume not less than three), and on such, and other equally unfounded pretexts, was grounded an application for an infringement of the Company's privileges. Whereas the fact is, that these 108 ships, with the addition of others subsequently admitted, were unloaded in the month of November, such only excepted as were delayed by causes not dependant on the Company.—The general state of the business performed by the Company during the last year will stand thus:—593 ships have been unloaded, and 106 smaller vessels and craft;—of the above number of 598 ships, 593 were completed upon the 3d Dec. 1808.—Thus so early as the close of the month of November, the great body of shipping in the West-India trade were completely cleared of their cargoes; an instance of dispatch singular and unexampled, and evidently proving the su-

periority of your Establishment, particularly under the embarrassing circumstances of an extraordinary accumulation of produce on hand, occasioned by an almost total stagnation of export: if these advantages be contrasted with the delays, impediments, losses, and abuses, which must have arisen under the former system, their value will be incalculable.—During the utmost pressure, and under peculiar circumstances of the season, the Company did undertake to provide at its own expence, and beyond its exclusive means, an extraordinary provision of warehouse room, but it did not become necessary to resort to it, beyond an accommodation for 5747 casks and 4137 boxes, and 511 barrels of prize or foreign sugar, and thus may the dispatch given to the shipping in such a season, afford the best proof of the adequacy of the Company's resources to the general exigencies of the trade; but it may be proper to add the following statement of the quantity of goods actually lodged within your warehouses at one time, exclusive of the articles on the quays:—102,647 hhds. and trs., 11,612 chests and brls. of Sugar.—14,681 puns. and hhds., Rum.—38,239 hhds. and trs., 190,408 bags, Coffee.—1,411 bales, 164 pockets, &c., Cotton.—24 casks, 3,168 bags, Pimento.—201 casks, 1,006 bags, Ginger.—1,100 casks, 13,257 bags, Cocoa.—1,786 casks, Wine.—Making a total of 11,612 chests, &c. 1,575 bales, 207,839 bags, 158,678 casks. Let this statement be compared with all the accommodation existing at the port, for the housing of West-India produce, previous to the formation of the docks, which according to the best computation in respect to the article of Sugar only, was not capable of containing beyond one third of the quantity, which has been actually deposited in your warehouses.—The system of providing distinctly for the shipping of goods to the West-Indies, and the security afforded thereby both to the ships and goods, belongs peculiarly to your Establishment; and, to a system so recent and dependant upon corresponding regulations of the revenue boards, it cannot reasonably be reproached that it is yet susceptible of improvement; sufficient however has appeared to shew that this part of your Establishment, is one, which must eventually prove of essential benefit to the West-India trade of the port.—The regulations of the Company have all been framed in strict consistency with its solid and permanent interests, by a constant and primary regard to the security of property,

the interests of the revenue, and the accommodation of the trade, and not in any case directed by narrow views of present profit, in contradistinction to those more essential objects.—With the laws and regulations of the revenue departments it is necessary that the Company should co-operate, and sometimes it has been accused of disappointments, and delays, originating solely in that connexion. But in respect to that part of the system, over which your Directors have controul, they are ready at all times to adopt suggestions for improvement, whenever they shall be found upon attentive consideration to be compatible with the great objects of the institution.—The principles by which the Court of Directors have uniformly governed their conduct, have been those of sound discretion in the application of the funds of the Company, a liberal construction, and performance, of its engagements with the public, and a scrupulous impartiality in the administration of business.—How far these objects have been faithfully pursued, and successfully accomplished, may best be evinced: as to the first by the prosperous state of your finances; as to the second by the details furnished by, and the facts connected with this report; and, as to the last, it may fairly be demanded whether one single instance of deviation can be produced.

---

ENGLAND.—*King's Speech (by Commission) at the opening of the Session of Parliament, on the 19th January, 1809.*

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN, We are commanded by his Majesty to acquaint you, that he has assembled you together in the firm persuasion that you will concur with him in opinion that the only way of obtaining a safe and honourable peace, is by a vigorous prosecution of the war.—His Majesty has ordered to be laid before you the Copy of the Overtures made to him by France and Russia, from Erfurth, together with the Correspondence which ensued, and the Declaration of his Majesty's sentiments on that occasion.—His Majesty trusts you will participate in his feelings on rejecting overtures of peace, the preliminary condition of which was, to abandon the people of Spain in the struggle they are now making for their independence.—His Majesty has commanded us to express to you the satisfaction he felt at the brilliant commencement of the campaign which restored his ancient ally, but he had reason to regret the manner in which it was terminated by a Convention,

of several parts of which he had found it necessary to express his disapprobation.—His Majesty has lately renewed the assurances of support to the Spanish government, in support of their national independence, which he voluntarily gave at the commencement of the struggle they are now making, and which he has no doubt will terminate triumphantly, should they persevere in support of their legitimate sovereign, and should the nation be true to themselves.—The assurances his majesty has given to the Spanish government, have been reduced to a Treaty of friendship and alliance, which will be laid before you as soon as the ratifications have been exchanged.—His Majesty trusts you will enable him to continue his support of the king of Sweden in the struggle he is making, he having concurred with his Majesty in rejecting any overtures from the enemy, which had as a preliminary condition, the sacrifice of the Spanish nation.

GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, His Majesty has ordered to be laid before you the estimates for the public service, and trusts you will provide him the means of carrying on the war with vigour.—His Majesty has the pleasure of assuring you that notwithstanding the exertions of the enemy to diminish our resources, the revenue continues to flourish to an extent the most satisfactory, and his Majesty believes that the contest may be carried on without any great or immediate addition to the burthen of his people.

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN, His Majesty congratulates you on the complete success of the plan for establishing a Local Militia.—And his Majesty trusts you will take such steps for the increase of the regular army as may enable him to pursue the campaign with vigour, without weakening the means of defence at home.

---

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Proclamation issued in Mexico, 16th Sept. 1808.*

INHABITANTS OF MEXICO, of all classes and conditions! Necessity is not subject to common laws. The city has seized the person of his excellency the Viceroy. His removal has been imperiously demanded by reasons of utility and general convenience. In the course of last night, the Royal Acuerdo, the most illustrious seignor, the Archbishop, and the other authorities, were convoked. They have submitted to the urgency of affairs; and the said Viceroy being divested of his authority, it has devolved, conformably to

the royal order of the 30th Oct. 1808, upon field marshal D. Pedro Gariby, until the dispatches brought by the Providence shall have been opened. He is actually in possession of the supreme authority. Be calm and tranquil; you are now governed by an accredited chief, with whose prudence you are acquainted. Confide in the vigilance of the Royal Acuerdo; all will turn out to your advantage. Impatience can only serve to divide men's minds, and to occasion mischiefs which may perhaps be irremediable. The said provisional chief, the Royal Acuerdo, and the other concurring authorities, give you every assurance that can be wished for.—By command of his excellency, the President, with the Royal Acuerdo, the most illustrious seignor Archbishop, and the other Authorities.—FRANCISCO XIMENEZ.

*Dispatch from the General in chief of the Army of Catalonia, to the Minister at War, 27th Nov. 1808.*

Most excellent seignor—According to the intention, of which I apprised your excellency in my dispatch of the 29th ult. the general attack took place yesterday on all the posts occupied by the enemy without the limits of Barcelona, from all of which he was immediately dislodged, and compelled to take refuge under the guns of the fortress, with the exception of the advantageous position of St. Pedro Martir which is the most commanding. The communication with this post being completely cut off, in consequence of our line being advanced to Hospitalet, Esplugas, Sarria, Gracia, and Horta, as your excellency will perceive from the plan which I have the honour to send you, I, upon this ground, summoned the commandant to surrender. He refused compliance, and I immediately gave orders for an attack; but at half past 12 o'clock this day he surrendered himself and his garrison prisoners of war, consisting of 104 privates and two officers. We found in the place four 4-pounders and one 2-pounder, with magazines of ammunition and stores. At the same time a firing was commenced from the right and centre of our line, and the enemy were repulsed as far as the walls of Barcelona, from which it will not now be an easy task for them to advance again. I now (four in the afternoon) forward this to your excellency in the mean time by a special messenger, for the satisfaction of his Majesty, until, by receiving the statements of the generals and commanders of columns, I shall be enabled to transmit to your excellency the details of the operations of

these two days.—Our line occupies the above-mentioned posts, and I have fixed the head-quarters of the army in this town, which is about a league's distance from it, &c. &c.

JUAN MIGUEL DE VIVES.  
*O'Neill's Report to Palafox respecting the battle of Tudela, 8 Dec. 1808.*

" In consequence of the actual situation of this city, threatened with a siege by the enemy, it has been until now found impossible to lay before the public an official account of the details of the attack and obstinate battle fought at Tudela on the 23rd ult.; a battle equally fatal and glorious to this army, which, supported only by its own strength and its own valour, maintained the contest for eight hours in the midst of the most dreadful fire. It is impossible to convey an adequate idea of the number of heroic achievements performed by the officers and soldiers, whilst one-half of the army was defending their posts with discharges of musketry, and the other were maintaining the contest with the bayonet, until the number of the slain on both sides left scarcely room for action, and both the contending armies retired.—The captain-general of this excellent army of reserve has received the following detailed dispatch from lieut.-gen. Don Juan O'Neil, who commanded the troops in the engagement, from Illueca, whither he retired with field marshal D. Felippe St. March.—Most excellent seignor; A few hours after my conference with your excellency at Caperoso, respecting the good condition of the troops under my command, at that most important point, full of ardour and enthusiasm, from the superiority which they conceived themselves to possess over the enemy, who for so long a period had not dared to attack us, and from advantages of greater magnitude which they anticipated in the direction of Pampeluna; and when your excellency, convinced of the necessity of not permitting a favourable opportunity to pass, for executing designs in which I cordially concurred, proceeded to consult with the captain-general of the army of the centre, I received a dispatch from the captain-general of the army of the centre, and the representative of the supreme central Junta, D. Francisco Palafox, dated the 21st inst. informing me of the extreme urgency that all my troops should immediately put themselves in motion, and proceed by way of Tudela, to the right of the line, which was to be formed upon Cascante and Tarragona, as far as the heights of Moncayo; and

charging me not to lose a moment, since they had given orders for the march of the army of the centre, and were on the point of attacking and defeating the enemy, in order to save that army; an object, the attainment of which would be of the greatest importance for Spain, and totally disconcert the plans of the enemy.—Surprised at the novelty of this dispatch, so completely at variance with the plan we had agreed upon at Caparoeo the day before, I sent to inform your excellency, and before I received your answer, your dispatch, dated at Tudela on the same day (the 21st), reached me, directing, that in consequence of what the captain-general of the centre had stated to you, I should, the instant I received it, march with the whole of my army, and the troops belonging to the centre attached to it, for Tudela, there to fix my head-quarters, it being understood that the troops that occupied the posts of Cintriniego, Calahorra, and the other parts of the Ebro, were already on their march for Borja and Tarazona, and consequently that any delay might be very injurious, and expose the army to be turned in that quarter. On the same day, as my troops were just setting off, I received your excellency's answer, confirming your previous order, in consequence of the army of the centre having already commenced its movement.—I cannot describe to your excellency the sensation felt by the troops under my command, in consequence of this retrograde movement, as all of them, previously animated by the preceding fortunate movements, found all their hopes frustrated, and saw themselves removed from the advanced situation that they always occupied in front of the enemy. An event so unexpected disheartened them; and in order to inspire them with the same degree of ardour which they had hitherto manifested, and to prevent the fatal consequences of which I was apprehensive, I exerted my authority, accompanying it with the most energetic persuasion, and shewing them the order of that evening, according to which the safety of the whole army depended upon our retrograde movement, and in short, telling them that it was the result of the express orders of your excellency, and must be obeyed.—This representation, in some degree, tranquillized them, and I proceeded with my troops to Tudela, where your excellency, the seignor representative, and the captain general of the army of the centre, were already arrived. At nine in the morning of the following day (23d),

col. Don F. Perera sent to inform me, that two columns of the enemy were deploying in front of Ablitas. In consequence of this intelligence, and the captain-general of the army of the centre having, the preceding evening, informed me, that the enemy had entered Cintrinmego, I ordered the generale to be beaten, apprising, at the same time, the captain-general, that as commander in chief, he might make the necessary dispositions. He ordered some reinforcements to advance, and soon after caused gen. St. March to do the same on the left, sending various corps of my division to the heights of Santa Barbara, to reinforce that important point, and to support the troops already occupying it belonging to the division of general Rova. As he left me on the high road with the remainder of my troops, I sent to him my aid-de-camp, D. B. Gelabert, to ascertain what I was to do, as the engagement was already begun. His answer was, that I should proceed to the centre of the line, where he was posted. Soon after, he ordered the remainder of the troops to join him, and he assigned me the command of the whole of the left wing. When I arrived, I found the heights on the left already occupied by the enemy, who threatened to turn us; but having received his order to attack them, and an assurance that the division of gen. La Pena would advance to my assistance, I determined to execute the attack by echelons of battalions. The battalion of the royal Spanish guards commenced it with such unexampled gallantry, that the enemy instantly abandoned that important post, leaving the field of battle covered with dead bodies. The same success attended the attack in front, by the regiments of the volunteers of Castile and Segerbia. While I was indulging in the satisfaction produced by our success, and considering the battle gained, two orderly officers of cavalry came to desire me, on the part of the captain-general, not to be alarmed by the appearance of a column of infantry, with a considerable body of cavalry, who were advancing on the left, as they were the troops of general la Pena coming from Cascante. Congratulating myself upon this aid, which would have decided the battle in our favour, I rode along my left to direct general St. March to continue the attack in the same order, when that general surprised me by telling me it was necessary we should retreat, as our right had been forced, that the enemy were in Tudela, and that all the troops that occupied the centre of one

position had retreated. This intelligence astonished me the more, as the captain-general had sent me no information of this event, a circumstance which appeared to me impossible; but a firing being heard in the rear of the olive plantations, I was convinced of the fact. In this melancholy situation, the division of general la Pena not having moved, and that which was announced as his division proving to be a corps of the enemy, of about 8000 infantry, and 2000 cavalry, I gave directions for retreating in the best possible order; placing the 2d regiment of Valencia in an oblique position to cover the retreat of our troops. The troops were surrounded on all sides, but they gallantly cut their way with the bayonet. I put myself at their head, and left gen. St. March, with the cavalry to protect this daring and only resource that was left to us. The general discharged this trust with the same exactness that he did every other duty confided to him during the action. I can assure your excellency, that I never witnessed an occasion in which all the officers and soldiers more completely performed their duty; but of those who were under my orders, I ought to make particular mention of the third battalion of the royal Spanish guards, and the regiments of Castile, Segorbia, and Turia. D. M. Velasco, commander of the artillery of my division; D. A. Ulloa, commander of general St. March's; D. J. Monino; D. R. del Pino, who though surrounded by the enemy, spiked a part of the artillery which they could not bring off, are very much entitled to consideration for having entirely destroyed three columns of the enemy.—The enemy's loss cannot be less than 8,000 men, as we may assure ourselves, when they admitted it exceeded 4,000. I have not yet received all the returns of the loss on our side, but I doubt whether it amounts to 2000 in killed, wounded, and missing. I have the satisfaction of having saved half of the artillery, which was brought off by routes almost impracticable, and of having been a near spectator of every thing that passed to the last moment. I can assure you, that in this unfortunate event all those under my command have done their duty to their king and country; and that had the captain-general ordered the army of the centre to support us, it would, beyond all doubt, have been the most glorious day for his majesty's arms, of any recorded in the history of this war.

*Palafox's Dispatch to the Central Junta.—Dec. 3, 1808.*

SEIGNOR: This capital has recently given an additional proof of that heroic patriotism and attachment to its sovereign which distinguish and characterise it. On the 30th of Nov. in the dusk of the evening, the enemy, being above 12,000 men in number, made their appearance in the quarter of Torrero and Casa Blanca, having come by Muel and Muria, on the roads from Madrid and Valencia. Part of them took post on the road, on a height situated between the hermitages of Soledad and Santa Barbara, and commanding La Casa Blanca; the rest ascended, under cover of the Ravine de la Muere which covers Torrero, and took possession of the Carthusian monastery of Conception. They had a considerable body at Alagon, and we were informed that 3000 men were advancing by way of Tauste and Castejon de Baldejussa a Zuera, in order to attack us at four points. The whole of the garrison were immediately ordered under arms, and the heroes of Saragossa also took up their muskets. All the posts were occupied, and the whole of the inhabitants went out with alacrity and enthusiasm to be spectators of the glorious action which was impending. On the 1st of Dec. at day-break, the enemy were dislodged from the Carthusian monastery, and compelled to fall back through the Ravine, when they took post in five columns on the heights that command Torrero, with the decided intention of making their attack in that quarter. They manœuvred until 10 o'clock a. m. at which hour they commenced their most decisive and vigorous attack in the direction of Casa Blanca. It was received on our side with a very brisk fire of musketry and cannon, which lasted until two o'clock, when the whole of the enemy's army in Soledad fell back, shamefully abandoning Torrero.

(To be continued.)

AMERICAN STATES.—*Letter from Mr. Giles, Member of the Embargo Committee, to Mr. Gullatin, Sec. of the Treasury, dated 11th Nov. 1808.*

DEAR SIR.—I am instructed by the Committee appointed to consider the several Embargo Laws, &c. to request you to lay before them with as little delay as possible, such information as your department affords upon the following questions.—First, What measures would be most effectual in preventing the violations or evasions of the several Embargo Laws; and enforcing

due observance thereof?—Second, Can any of the inconveniences of the present system be remedied by further modifications; and what modifications would effect that object? Be pleased, Sir, to accept assurances of my high consideration and regard.

*Letter from Mr. Gullatin, in Answer to Mr. Giles. Dated, 21st, Nov. 1808.*

SIR—Indisposition has prevented an earlier answer to your letter of the 14th inst.—For better preventing coasting vessels regularly cleared from violating the Embargo, two measures appear necessary:—1st. That the amount of the Bonds should be increased.—2dly. That neither capture, distress, or any other accident should be admitted as a plea, or be given in evidence on trial.—By the first regulation the temptation of going to a foreign port, in hopes that the profit on the sale of the cargo will indemnify for the forfeiture of the penalty, will be done away. By the second, every expectation of escaping the payment of the penalty under fraudulent pretences will be disappointed; and the power of remitting the penalties in the few cases of unavoidable accident which may occur, will remain as heretofore, and as in other cases, with the treasury.—As the object of those two regulations will be to make the bond a sufficient and complete security, they will have a tendency to relieve, in a considerable degree, the coasting trade from the inconvenience resulting from detentions. The sufficiency of the bond will in many doubtful cases remove the necessity of detaining the vessels, or what amounts to the same, of informing the owners that unless they reduce the amount of their cargoes they will be detained.—I would also submit the propriety of placing under the controul of the President, that power of detention vested in the collectors by the act of the 25th of April last. That subject has been a constant source of complaint and difficulty. It has been the uniform practice from the establishment of the government of the United States, to give positive instructions to the collectors respecting the execution of the laws, and which they were bound to obey, unless a different construction should be established by a legal decision. This indeed was essentially necessary, in order to secure an uniform construction and execution of the laws. But the provision now alluded to makes the detention to rest on the opinion of each collector, and this must necessarily produce a great diversity in

the manner in which the power should be executed. All has been done that can be done to obviate that evil; and the President being authorised to decide on the detentions when made, the opportunity was taken to inform the collectors of what in his opinion should be a proper cause of detention. This however could be given only as opinion, and operate as a recommendation, and not as an order. Nor does it appear practicable to establish uniformity, and to prevent partiality, and either laxity or too great severity in practice, unless the power of prescribing general rules in that respect by which the collectors will be bound to abide, be vested in the President.—I am aware that there is another mode of evasion, by regular coasting vessels, which will not be prevented by either of the preceding provisions. Either whilst in port or on their way down our rivers and bays, coasting vessels may receive articles not entered on their manifest, which they put on board other vessels lying off the coast for that purpose.—But it is not perceived that any legal provision can prevent that infraction, nor that any other remedy can be found than the vigilance of the officers. Another general regulation will, however, be suggested perhaps useful as a permanent measure, but which would at all events, under existing circumstances, give additional security for the observance of the laws, and afford some relief to our own seamen; to wit, a prohibition to employ any aliens either as masters or part of the crew of any coasting vessel.—It is still more difficult to guard against violations by vessels departing without clearance, in open defiance of the laws. The following provisions, on mature consideration, appear the most efficient that can be devised against infractions which it is the more necessary to repress as they may be daily expected to increase, and threaten to prostrate the law and government itself.—1st. To forbid expressly under pain of forfeiture (the penalty now being only implied) the lading of any vessel without the permission of the collector, and without the bond for a coasting voyage being previously given;—authorising the collectors to refuse permission, unless the object be that of a lawful coasting or fishing voyage. The great number of vessels now laden and in a state of readiness to depart shews the necessity of this provision. If there be cases in which the indulgences of converting vessels into warehouses, ought to be granted,

there will be no hardship, where the intention is fair, to require a bond similar to that given for a coasting voyage. And the collectors should likewise in such cases be expressly authorised to take such efficient precautions as will put it out of the power of such vessels to sail without warning.—2. In order to prevent those fraudulent sales of vessels by which ostensible owners of no responsibility are substituted to those from whom penalties might be recovered, it is necessary to provide that those owners of vessels whose names appear on the register or licence, should continue to be reputed as such, and liable to the penalties in case of infraction of the laws, until the register or licence shall have been actually surrendered and new papers shall have been regularly granted by the collector to the purchaser, and in every such case, of purchase, a sufficient bond that the embargo shall not be infringed, to be previously required.—3. The power to seize unusual deposits now vested in the collectors of districts adjacent to the territories of foreign nations should, as well contemplated in the Bill passed by the House of Representatives, be extended to all the districts.—That this is an arbitrary power which nothing but the unremitting efforts in some places to evade the law can publicly justify, cannot be denied; and it should, like that of detention, be placed under the controul of the President, and be executed only in conformity with such general rules as he would prescribe.—4. Exclusively of the assistance which may be derived from gun-boats and from the armed vessels of the United States, it would be advisable to authorise the President to add ten or twelve cutters to the present establishment. Fast sailing vessels of every draft of water, and requiring only from 15 to 30 men each, are mostly wanted, and would, for the object contemplated, be as useful as the largest frigates.—5. It is with regret that the necessity of authorising, on the application of the collectors, an immediate call of the local physical force of the country, must also be stated. But such partial acts of violence as have taken place in some of the seaports, cannot be prevented by the circuitous manner in which the public force must now be brought out in support of the laws. And no doubt exists that the mass of the citizens, whether they approve or disapprove of the Embargo, would in every port instantaneously suppress any such outrage, they can be called upon to act in a legal manner.

E

—Some other provisions appear also necessary for the purpose of carrying the laws more completely into effect along our land frontiers.—1. The exportation of specie by land should be expressly prohibited.—2. The power of detaining deposits should be so expressed as to leave no doubt of the authority to detain waggons and other carriages laden and actually on their way to a foreign territory. Although I cannot perceive any reason for the distinction, it has been supposed in one of the districts, that the law which authorised the detention of flour, beef, or potash deposited in a warehouse, did not extend to the case of their being deposited in a waggon although evidently on its way to Canada.—3. The offence now published by law is that of exportation. This is not consummated till after the property has been actually carried beyond the lines, where being in a foreign jurisdiction, it cannot be seized: so that forfeiture, which is the most efficient penalty, can never apply to exportations by land; and the bond being required, as in the case of vessels, the only remedy is the uncertain one of recovering penalties against apparent offenders who either abscond or have no property. How far it may be practicable to make the act of preparing the means of exportation punishable, or provide some other remedy, is submitted to the Committee.—But it must also be observed, that every degree of opposition to the laws, which falls short of treason, is now with but few exceptions, an offence undefined and unprovided for by the laws of the United States. Whence it follows that such offences remain unpunished when the state authorities do not interfere. The necessity of defining those offences by law as misdemeanors, and of providing an adequate punishment, appears obvious.—I will beg leave here to add that it does not appear necessary to continue any longer the indulgence granted to the British merchants to import for the use of the Indians articles of which the importation is generally prohibited by law, as that privilege is liable to great abuse, and affords just ground of dissatisfaction to American citizens.—Whether it be advisable to continue the permission given to those Indian traders to export furs and peltry, is a question to be decided by political considerations.—The last branch of the subject to which I wish at present to call the attention of the committee, relates to interruptions and certain injurious proceedings attempted under colour of law.—1. Vexatious suits are brought against col-

lectors, which not only perplex faithful officers, but have the effect of intimidating others, and prevent an energetic performance of their duties. The only provisions which have occurred to me on the subject, are to enable the collectors who may be sued, always to remove the cause before a court of the United States; to make a certificate issued by the proper authority, that there was reasonable cause of detention, protect them against damages in cases of detentions, in the same manner as is now provided in cases of seizures; and to provide for the safe keeping, and restoring when proper, and on security being given, the vessels and property which may be detained.—2. Attempts have in several instances been made to wrest from the collectors by writs of replevin issued by the state courts or officers, property detained or seized by said collectors, or which, in any other manner, is in their possession in conformity with some law of the United States. It is evident that such attempts, if submitted to, would defeat not only the embargo but also the revenue laws of the United States; that whenever property is by virtue of the law of the United States in the possession of a collector, marshal, or any other of their officers, no process *in rem*, which will take the property away, whether of replevin, attachment, or any other, can be legally issued by a state authority; and that the sheriff or other person executing the same must be considered as a mere trespasser, and be resisted accordingly. But there is no other way at present to resist such illegal process but actual force. And it appears necessary that another remedy should be afforded, by providing a summary mode of superseding any such process, through the interference of the courts of justice of the United States; and by making it penal for any sheriff, or other person, to execute the same, or in any manner to attempt to take property which by virtue of any law of the United States is in the collector's possession.—3. In some instances where vessels and cargoes libelled for infractions of the embargo have been restored to their owners on their giving security for the appraised value, the valuations have been so low as to reduce the forfeiture to an inconsiderable sum, thereby defeating altogether the law. It is suggested that this might be prevented by a provision authorising and directing the district judges to set aside on motion of the district attorney, such valuation, whenever in their opinion falling short of the true value.—On the

subject of *mandamus*, I will only observe that, in the only instance which has taken place, the court, supposing they had jurisdiction, could not, from the manner in which the question was brought before them, having decided otherwise than they did, but that it is desirable that the question of jurisdiction, as it relates either to the courts in whom the power ought to be vested, or to the courts to which it should extend, should be precisely defined by law.—I have not in this communication taken into consideration the technical defects of the existing embargo laws, because prosecutions do not fall within my immediate cognizance, and I do not feel competent to the task of pointing out the necessary alterations. Measures have however been taken to procure on that subject and from the proper sources, information which will hereafter be laid before the committee.—To the remaining enquiry of the committee, whether the inconveniences of the present system may not in some degree be removed, I can only answer, generally, that a law which lays such extensive restrictions as the embargo, cannot be carried into effect without imposing serious inconveniences even on the domestic intercourse of the United States; and that these must necessarily be increased in proportion to the opposition and efforts to evade or violate the law. It has already been stated that provisions which will render the bond given by coasting vessels a complete security against violations of them, will diminish the necessity and extent of more arbitrary restrictions. An authority to permit on proper security being given such vessels when they arrive in port, to keep their cargoes on board, would afford some relief. And I think that the credit on duties accruing on the importation of some articles which was allowed by the act of 10th March last, should be extended to all importations of the same articles made after the passing of the act, those made in vessels which sailed under special permission only excepted. With respect to this last class of importations, as they were permitted by special indulgence, as it is understood that it has been impossible in many cases to prevent its being abused, and as in almost all the parties having a species of exclusive privilege, have made sufficiently profitable voyages, the propriety, particularly in the existing situation of the revenue, of allowing them also the advantages of an extended credit on duties, is not perceived.

#### *Report of the Embargo Committee.*

AFTER a period of 15 years of peace hardly interrupted by transient hostilities, and of prosperity unparalleled in the history of nations; the United States are, for the first time since the treaty which terminated the revolutionary war, placed in a situation equally difficult, critical and dangerous.—Those principles recognized by the civilized world under the name of Law of Nations, which heretofore controlled belligerent powers, regulated the duties of neutrals, and protected their rights, are now avowedly disregarded or forgotten by Great Britain and France. Each of those two nations captures and condemns all American vessels trading with her enemies or her enemy's allies, and every European power having become a party in the contest, the whole of our commerce with Europe and European colonies, becomes liable to capture by either one or the other. If there be any nominal exception, it is made on a condition of tribute, which only adds insult to the injury.—The only plea urged in justification of these hostilities, is that of retaliation, grounded on a presumed acquiescence of the United States in previous aggressions by the other party. Waving a discussion of the correctness of the principle of retaliation, a principle doubtful in itself and altogether inadmissible to the extent to which it has been carried, and when operating on the neutral rather than on the enemy: it is altogether untrue that the United States have voluntarily acquiesced in the unlawful aggressions of either nation; omitted or delayed any measures calculated to obtain redress, or in any respect deviated from that impartiality to which they were bound by their neutrality. France has alluded to the violations of the national flag, and of the sovereignty of the United States, in the instances of Pierce's murder, of the outrage on the Chesapeake, and of the destruction of the Impeccable. The measures taken to obtain redress in those cases are of public notoriety, and it may be added, that with the exception of the last, those aggressions on the sovereignty of the United States did not affect their neutrality, and gave no right to France either of complaint or interference. Setting aside irregularities of less importance, and equally chargeable to both nations, such as the British order of June 1803, and the decree of the French general Ferrand; the principal violations by England of the neutral rights of America, prior to the Berlin decree of November

1806, and which if acquiesced in might have given grounds of complaint to France, are the capture of American vessels laden with colonial produce, founded on a renewal of that pretended principle generally called "the Rule of 1756," the impressment of American seamen, compelled thereby to become the auxiliaries of England against France, and proclamation of nominal blockades, particularly that of the coast from the river Elbe to Brest notified in May 1806.—It will not be asserted that the United States have ever tamely acquiesced in either of those pretensions. It will not be denied, that with respect to the two first, the most strenuous efforts were incessantly made to procure an alteration of the British system.—It is true that to the nominal proclamation blockades of England, the United States had opposed only spirited and repeated remonstrances, and that these had not always been successful. But the measures which a neutral nation may be supposed bound to take against the infractions of its neutrality, must always bear a certain proportion to the extent and nature of the injury received, and to the means of opposition. It cannot certainly be pretended that a hasty resort to war, should in every such instance have become the duty of America. Nor can the irregularities of England, in declaring in a state of blockade, a certain extent of coast, part of which was not and the whole of which could not, even by her powerful navy, be actually invested and blockaded, be pleaded in justification of that decree, by which France, without an efficient fleet, pretends to announce the blockade of the dominions of a power which has the uncontested command of the sea, and before no port of which she can station a single vessel.—The Milan decree of 1807 can still less rest for its defence on the supposed acquiescence of the United States in the British orders of the preceding month, since those orders which have not certainly been acquiesced in, were not even known in America at the date of the decree. And it is proper here to add, that the French have, particularly by the sequestration of certain vessels in their ports, and by burning our ships on the high seas, gone even beyond the tenor of their own extraordinary edicts.—The allegation of an acquiescence in the Berlin decree of November 1806, by which alone the British government pretends to justify the orders in council, is equally unfounded. In the note on that subject addressed on the 31st Dec. 1806, by the British government to the American ministers, after hav-

ing stated that "they could not believe that the enemy would ever seriously attempt to enforce such a system," the following declaration is expressly made, "If, however, the enemy should carry these threats into execution, and if neutral nations, contrary to all expectation, should acquiesce in such usurpations, his Majesty might probably be compelled, however reluctantly, to retaliate in his just defence, &c." The two requisites necessary in the opinion of Great Britain to justify retaliation, are stated to be the execution of the decree, and the acquiescence of neutral nations. Yet, within eight days after, and in the face of that Declaration, without waiting for ascertaining either of those facts, the retaliating British order of January 7, 1807, was issued, which, contrary to the acknowledged law of nations, subjected to capture, vessels of the United States sailing from the port of one belligerent to a port of another belligerent.—The United States in the mean while and without delay, had taken the necessary steps to ascertain the manner in which the French government intended to execute their decree.—That decree might be construed merely as a municipal law forbidding the introduction of British merchandize, and the admission of vessels coming from England. Under that aspect, and if confined to that object, the neutral rights of America were not affected by its operation.—A belligerent may, without any infraction of neutral rights, forbid the admission into his ports of any vessel coming from the ports of his enemy. And France had undoubtedly the same right to exclude from her dominions every species of British merchandize, which the United States have exercised in forbidding the importation of certain species. Great Britain might be injured by such regulations: but America had no more right to complain of that part of the decree, than France had to object to the American Non-importation Act. So far indeed as respects the United States, they were placed by the municipal part of the decree in the same situation, in relation to France, in which they are placed in their intercourse with Great Britain by the permanent laws of that country. The French decree forbids American vessels to import British merchandize into France. The British Navigation Act forbids American vessels to import French merchandize into England. But that broad clause of the Berlin decree which declared the British islands in a state of blockade, though not followed by regulations to that ef-

fect, still threatened an intended operation on the high seas. This if carried into effect, would be a flagrant violation of the neutral rights of the United States, and as such they would be bound to oppose it. The minister of the United States at Paris immediately applied for explanation on that subject; and the French minister of marine, on the 24th Dec. 1806, seven days before the date of the above-mentioned note of the British government, stated in answer, that the decree made no alteration in the regulations then observed in France with regard to neutral navigation, or to the commercial convention of the United States with France. That the declaration of the British islands being in a state of blockade, did not change the existing French laws concerning maritime captures, and that American vessels could not be taken at sea for the mere reason of their being going to or returning from an English port.—The execution of the decree comported for several months with those explanations; several vessels were arrested for having introduced articles of English growth or manufacture, and among them some which being actually from England, and laden with English colonial produce, had entered with forged papers as if coming from the United States. But no alteration of the first construction given by the French government took place until the month of September, 1807. The first condemnation on the principle that the decree subjected neutral vessels to capture on the high seas, was that of the *Horizon*, on the 10th of October following.—Prior to that time there could have been no acquiescence in a decree infringing the neutral rights of the United States, because till that time it was explained, and what was more important, executed in such a manner as not to infringe those rights, because until then no such infringement had taken place. The ministers of the United States at London, at the request of the British minister, communicated to him on the 18th of October, 1807, the substance of the explanations received, and of the manner in which the decree was executed. For they were at that time ignorant of the change which had taken place.—It was on the 18th of September, 1807, that a new construction of the decree took place; an instruction having on that day been transmitted to the council of prizes by the minister of justice, by which that court was informed, that French armed vessels were authorized, under that decree, to seize, without exception, in neutral vessels, either English property or

merchandise of English growth or manufacture.—An immediate explanation having been asked from the French minister of foreign relations, he confirmed, in his answer of the 7th of October, 1807, the determination of his government to adopt that construction. Its first application took place on the 10th of the same month, in the case of the *Horizon*, of which the minister of the United States was not informed until the month of November; and on the 12th of that month, he presented a spirited remonstrance against that infringement of the neutral rights of the United States. He had, in the meanwhile, transmitted to America the instruction to the council of prizes of the 18th of September. This was received on the 1st of December: and a copy of the decision in the case of the *Horizon*, having at the same time reached government, the president, aware of the consequences which would follow that new state of things, communicated immediately to Congress the alteration of the French decrees, and recommended the embargo, which was accordingly laid on the 22d of December, 1807; at which time it was well understood, in this country, that the British orders in council of November preceding had issued, although they were not officially communicated to our government.—On the 11th of that month, those orders did actually issue, declaring that all the ports of France, of her Allies, and of any other country at war with England, and all other ports of Europe, from which, although not at war with England, the British flag was excluded, should thenceforth be considered as if the same were actually blockaded—that all trade in articles of the produce or manufacture of the said countries should be deemed unlawful; and that every vessel trading from or to the said countries, together with all goods and merchandise on board, and also all articles of the produce or manufacture of the said countries, should be liable to capture and condemnation—These orders cannot be defended on the ground of their being intended as retaliating on account of the Berlin decree, as construed, and uniformly executed from its date to the 18th of September 1807, its construction and execution having till then infringed no neutral rights. For certainly, the monstrous doctrine will not be asserted, even by the British government, that neutral nations are bound to resist not only the acts of belligerent powers which violate their rights, but also those municipal regulations, which, how-

ever they may injure the enemy, are lawful and do not affect the legitimate rights of the neutral. The only retaliation to be used in such cases, must be such as will operate on the enemy without infringing the rights of the neutral. If solely intended as a retaliation on the Berlin decree, as executed prior to the month of September, the British orders in council should have been confined to forbidding the introduction into Great Britain, of French or enemy's merchandise, and the admission into British ports of neutral vessels, coming from a French or other enemy's port. Indeed, the ground of retaliation on account of any culpable acquiescence of neutrals in decrees, violating their rights, is abandoned by the very tenor of the orders; their operation being extended to those countries from which the British flag was excluded, such as Austria, although such countries were neither at war with Great Britain, nor had passed any decree in any way affecting or connected with neutral rights.—Nor are the orders justifiable on the pretence of an acquiescence on the part of the United States, in the French decree as construed and executed subsequent to the 18th Sept. 1807, when it became an evident infraction of their rights, and such as they were bound to oppose. For their minister at Paris immediately made the necessary remonstrances, and the orders were issued not only without having ascertained whether the United States would acquiesce in the injurious alteration of the French decree, but more than one month before that alteration was known in America. It may even be asserted that the alteration was not known in England when the orders in council were issued; the instruction of the 18th September, 1807, which gave the new and injurious construction, not having been promulgated in France, and its first publication having been made in December, 1807, and by the American government itself.—The British orders in council are, therefore, unjustifiable on the principle of retaliation, even giving to that principle all the latitude which has ever been avowedly contended for.—They are in open violation of the solemn declaration made by the British ministers in December, 1806; that retaliation on the part of Great Britain would depend on the execution of an unlawful decree, and on the acquiescence of neutral nations in such infraction of their rights. And they were also issued, notwithstanding the official communication made by the ministers of the United States,

that the French decree was construed and executed so as not to infringe their neutral rights, and without any previous notice or intimation, denying the correctness of that statement.—The Berlin Decree as expounded and executed subsequent to the 18th September, 1807, and the British orders in council of the 11th November ensuing, are, therefore, as they affect the United States, coterminous aggressions of the belligerent powers, equally unprovoked and equally indefensible on the presumed ground of acquiescence. These, together with the Milan decree of December, 1807, which filled the measure, would on the principle of self-defence have justified immediate hostilities against both nations on the part of the United States. They thought it more eligible in the first instance by withdrawing their vessels from the ocean, to avoid war, at least, for a season, and at the same time, to snatch their immense and defenceless commerce from impending destruction.—Another appeal has in the mean time been made, under the authority vested in the President for that purpose, to the justice and true interests of France and England. The propositions made by the United States and the arguments urged by their ministers are before Congress. By these, the very pretext of the illegal edicts was removed, and it is evident that a revocation by either nation on the ground on which it was asked, either must have produced, what both pretended to have in view, a restoration of the freedom of commerce, and of the acknowledged principles of the law of nations; or in case of refusal by the other belligerent, would have carried into effect, in the most efficient manner, the ostensible object of the edicts, and made the United States a party in the war against him. The effort has been ineffectual.—The propositions have been actually rejected by one of the Belligerent powers, and remain unanswered by the other. In that state of things, what course ought the United States to pursue? Your committee can perceive no other alternative, but abject and degrading submission; war with both nations; or a continuance and enforcement of the present suspension of commerce.—The first cannot require any discussion. But the pressure of the embargo, so sensibly felt, and the calamities inseparable from a state of war, naturally create a wish that some middle course might be discovered, which should avoid the evils of both, and not be inconsistent with national honour and independance. That illusion must be dissipated; and it is

necessary that the people of the United States should fully understand the situation in which they are placed.—There is no other alternative, but war with both nations, or a continuance of the present system. For war with one of the belligerents only would be submission to the edicts and will of the other ; and a repeal in whole or in part of the embargo must necessarily be war or submission.—A general repeal without arming, would be submission to both nations.—A general repeal and arming of our merchant vessels, would be war with both, and war of the worst kind, suffering the enemies to plunder us without retaliation upon them.—A partial repeal must, from the situation of Europe, necessarily be actual submission to one of the aggressors, and war with the other.—The last position, is the only one on which there can be any doubt ; and it will be most satisfactorily demonstrated by selecting amongst the several modifications, which might be suggested, which that may on first view appear the least exceptionable ; a proposition to repeal the embargo, so far only as relates to those powers, which have not or do not execute any decrees injurious to the neutral rights of the United States.—It is said that the adoption of that proposition would restore our commerce with the native powers of Asia and Africa, and with Spain, Portugal, Sweden and Russia. Let this be taken for granted, although the precise line of conduct now pursued by most of those nations, in relation to the United States, is not correctly ascertained. So far as relates to any advantages which would result from that measure, if confined to its ostensible object, it will be sufficient to observe, that the exports of articles of the domestic produce of the United States, during the year ending the 30th September 1807, amounted to 43,700,000, and that the portion exported to the countries above enumerated falls short of seven millions ; an amount too inconsiderable, when compared with the bulk of our exports, to deserve attention, even if a question affecting the independence of the nation was to be decided by considerations of immediate profit.—But the true effect of the proposition would be to open an indirect trade with Great Britain, which, through St. Bartholomew and Havannah, Lisbon, Cadiz or Gottenburg, would receive, at prices reduced by glutted markets, and for want of competition, all the provisions, naval stores, raw materials for her manufactures, and other articles which she may want. Whether

she would be satisfied with that favourable state of things, or whether, considering that boon as a pledge of unqualified submission, she would, according to the tenor of her orders, interrupt our scanty commerce with Russia, and occasionally under some new pretext, capture rather than purchase the cargoes intended for her own use, is equally uncertain and unimportant. Nor can it be doubted that a measure which would supply, exclusively, one of the belligerents, would be war with the other. Considered merely as a question of profit, it would be much more eligible, at once to raise the embargo in relation to Great Britain, as we would then, at least, have the advantages of a direct market with the consumer. But the proposition can only be defended on the ground that France is the only aggressor, and, that having no just reason to complain of England, it is our duty to submit to her orders. On that inadmissible supposition, it would not only be more candid, but also more dignified, as well as a more advantageous course, openly to join England, and to make war against France. The object would be clearly understood, an Ally would be obtained, and the meanness of submission might be better palliated.—It appears unnecessary to pursue any further the examination of propositions, which the difficult situation of the United States could alone have suggested, and which will prove more inadmissible, or impracticable, as the subject is more thoroughly investigated. The alternative is painful ; it is between a continual suspension of commerce and war with both England and France. But the choice must ultimately be made between the two ; and it is important that we should be prepared for either the one or the other.—The aggressions of England and France, collectively affecting almost the whole of our commerce, and persisted in, notwithstanding repeated remonstrances, explanations, and propositions the most candid and unexceptionable, are to all intents and purposes, a maritime war waged by both nations against the United States. It cannot be denied, that the ultimate and only effectual mode of resisting that warfare, if persisted in, is war. A permanent suspension of commerce, after repeated and unavailing efforts to obtain peace, would not properly be resistance : it would be withdrawing from the contest, and abandoning our indisputable right freely to navigate the ocean. The present unsettled state of the world, the extraordinary situation in which

the United States are placed, and the necessity, if war be resorted to, of making it at the same time against both nations, and these the two most powerful of the world, are the principal causes of hesitation. There would be none in resorting to that remedy, however calamitous, if a selection could be made on any principle of justice, or without a sacrifice of national independence.—On a question of such difficulty, involving the most important interests of the Union, and which has not, perhaps, until lately, been sufficiently considered, your Committee think the house alone competent to pronounce a decisive opinion: and they have, in this report, confined themselves to an exposition of the subject, and to such introductory resolutions, as will be equally applicable to either alternative. The first of these being merely declaratory of a determination not to submit to foreign aggressions, may, perhaps, at a first view, appear superfluous. It is however, believed by the committee, that a pledge by the representatives of the nation, that they will not abandon its essential rights, will not at this critical moment be unacceptable.—The misapprehensions which seem to have existed, and the misrepresentations which have been circulated, respecting the state of our foreign relations, render also such declaration expedient. And it may not be useless that every foreign nation should understand that its aggressions never will be justified or encouraged by any description of American citizens. For the question for every citizen now is, whether he will rally round the government of his choice, or enlist under foreign banners? Whether he will be for his country or against his country?

---

*Report of a Committee of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, upon the subject of the Embargo, dated 15th Nov. 1808.*

THE committee appointed to consider “Whether it will be expedient for this legislature to adopt any measure with a view to procure a repeal of the laws of the United States, interdicting to the citizens all foreign commerce, and imposing vexatious embarrassments on the coasting trade; to relieve the people of the commonwealth from their present distressed state, and to arrest the progress of that ruin which threatens to involve all classes of the community,” beg leave to report: That the committee perceive with the most serious regret, that the distresses occasioned by the several laws imposing an embargo, have borne with extreme and

increasing pressure upon the people; and every day’s experience justifies a belief, that a continuance of these laws must soon become intolerable. As measures of coercion, they are now acknowledged to be altogether impotent. They afford satisfaction to France, and are regarded as ineffectual demonstrations of a hostile disposition by Great Britain. Upon our own country, their effects are becoming daily and palpably more injurious. The produce of our agriculture, of our forests, and our fisheries, is excluded altogether from every foreign market; our merchants and mechanics are deprived of employment; our coasting trade is interrupted and harrassed by the most grievous embarrassments; and our foreign trade is becoming diverted into channels, from which there is no prospect of its return. The sources of our revenue are dried up, and government must soon resort to direct taxation. Our sailors are forced to expatriate themselves. Strong temptations are offered to systematical evasions of the laws, which tend to corrupt the spirit of honourable commerce, and will materially injure the public morals. In fact, the evils which are menaced by the continuance of this policy are so enormous and deplorable, the suspension of commerce is so contrary to the habits of our people, and so repugnant to their feelings and interests, that they must soon become intolerable, and endanger our domestic peace and the union of these states. As the embargo laws have been the cause of the public distress, your committee are of opinion that no equal, permanent, or effectual relief can be afforded to the citizens of the commonwealth, but by the repeal of these laws. They persuade themselves that the congress of the United States must be fully impressed with a sense of the total inefficacy of these laws for any valuable purpose, and of their direct tendency to the most serious consequences. Your committee, therefore, trust, that congress will not fail to repeal them. In this confidence, therefore, your committee are of opinion, that, upon this subject, the legislature should, in its present session, confine itself to a repeated disapprobation of the laws interdicting foreign commerce, and to instructing our senators, and requesting our representatives in congress to use their utmost exertions to procure their repeal.—Your committee might have contented themselves with the preceding remarks, had not the late Message of the President of the United States excited the most serious

alarm; which, in the present critical state of the country, they conceive it a duty to express. They perceive, with the most painful regret, that, in the estimation of the president, our country is now presented with the only alternative of a continued embargo, or a ruinous war; but they cannot hesitate to express their confident belief that the wisdom of the government may yet find means to avoid the necessity of electing between these great public calamities. If, however, this severe necessity exists in regard to Great Britain, they are led by the message to presume that it results, in a great measure, if not entirely, from the determination of the executive to adhere to the proclamation of July, 1807, interdicting all British ships of war from the waters of the United States; which has been, and as we infer from the message, is still deemed by the British Government, a measure so inhospitable and oppressive, if not hostile in its character, as to form an insuperable obstacle to amicable adjustment.—Upon this delicate and important subject, the committee are far from asserting, that the attack on the frigate Chesapeake did not justify the original issuing of this proclamation, and enforcing it so long as the injury might be presumed to have the sanction of the British government. But as this violation of the neutral rights was promptly and explicitly disavowed by the Sovereign of the aggressor, before the remonstrances or measures of our government could be known: as the right to search our national ships was expressly disclaimed, and a special envoy deputed for the professed object of making to our government a full, satisfactory, and public reparation, on the simple condition of a previous revocation of this proclamation; your committee are constrained to declare their opinion, that such a revocation, under such circumstances, would not have involved any dishonourable concession, or an abandonment of any just right of pretensions, but would have been a fair, reasonable, and magnanimous pledge of the sincerity of the wishes of the American Government to restore the accustomed relations of peace and amity between the two countries. This course must have compelled the British envoy to have offered that ample and honourable reparation, which would have been deemed by our nation and by the world, an adequate atonement for the outrage; or have justified, in the event of its refusal, not only the renewal of the proclamation,

but the adoption of measures of the most rigorous and hostile description.—But even on the precise presumption that the course adopted by the government, in refusing to revoke the proclamation as a preliminary to the adjustment of that controversy, be sanctioned by the usages of nations, and the justice of our claims, your Committee are still of opinion, that a punctilious adherence to diplomatic forms and precedents should not be maintained at the risk of war, by a nation whose genius and policy are pacific; and which, while justly jealous of its national honour and independence, looks principally to the substantial security of those blessings, and regards as insignificant those petty contentions which originating in courtly pride and vanity, frequently terminate in bloody wars: and they, therefore, think that this proclamation ought not, in the present situation of Europe and this country, to remain as the only, or even as the principal, barrier to the restoration of our amicable relations with the British nation.—Your Committee therefore ask leave to report the following resolutions:—Resolved, that the Senators of this commonwealth in congress, be instructed, and the representatives thereof requested, to use their strenuous exertions to procure an immediate repeal of the various laws imposing an embargo on the ships and vessels of the United States; as the only equal and effectual means of affording permanent relief to the citizens of this commonwealth from the aggravated evils which they now experience.—Resolved, that although this legislature would cheerfully support the general government in the prosecution of a just and necessary war, yet they cannot perceive the necessity intimated in the message of the President to congress, of continuing the embargo, or resorting to war. That it is not the policy of the United States to engage in a controversy with any nation, upon points of diplomatic usage, or equivocal right, provided substantial reparation for injuries can be obtained; and that the revocation of the proclamation interdicting the British ships of war from our waters ought not, in the opinion of this legislature, to be deemed an inadmissible preliminary, which should obstruct the adjustment of the controversy between the United States and Great Britain.

---

*Twenty-first Bulletin of the French Army in Spain. (No Date.)*

THE English entered Spain on the 29th Oct. during the months of Nov. and Dec.

they beheld the destruction of the army of Galicia at Espinosa ; of the army of Estremadura at Burgos, of that of Arragon and Valencia, at Tudela ; of the army of reserve at Somo-Sierra ; in fine, they beheld the fall of Madrid without making a single movement, and without any attempt to succour the Spanish armies, to whom, however, a division of the English troops would have proved of considerable assistance. In the beginning of December, information was received that the columns of the British army were retreating on Corunna, where they were to re-embark. By later accounts, it afterwards appeared that they had halted, and that on the 16th Dec. they set out from Salamanca in order to take the field. As early as the 15th, the light cavalry had marched from Valladolid. The whole of the English army passed the Douro, and arrived on the 23d in presence of the duke of Dalmatia at Saldanha.—As soon as the Emperor was apprised at Madrid of this unexpected determination on the part of the English, he marched in order to cut off their retreat, and pursue their rear; But notwithstanding the diligence exerted by the French troops, the passage of the mountain of Guadarrama, which was covered with snow, the incessant rain, and overflowing of the torrents, delayed their march full two days.—On the 22d the Emperor left Madrid. His head-quarters were on the 23d at Villa-Castin, the 25th at Tordesillas, and on the 27th at Medina de Rio-Secco. On the 24th, at break of day, the enemy had began to move, in order to outflank the left of the duke of Dalmatia, but having been informed during the morning of the movement that took place at Madrid, they immediately began to retreat, abandoning their Spanish adherents, whose passions they had inflamed, the remains of the Gallician army, that had conceived fresh hopes, some of their hospitals, a part of their baggage, and a great number of stragglers. They committed great devastations, the inevitable result of forced marches of troops in retreat; they carried away with them mules, horses, and several other effects; they pillaged a great number of churches and convents. In the abbey of Sahagun, which contained 60 monks, and which had all along been respected by the French army, they committed every sort of depredation. Every where the priests and the monks were seen flying at their approach.—This disorderly conduct exasperated the country against them, and their difference of language,

manners, and of religion, contributed not a little to that disposition of men's minds. They reproached the Spaniards with having no longer an army to unite with theirs, and with having deceived the English government. The Spaniards returned for answer, that Spain had numerous armies, but that the English had allowed them to be destroyed without having made any effort to assist them. During the 15 days that have just elapsed, they did not fire a single musket. The light cavalry only had given some blows with their swords. Gen. Durensel, at the head of 400 light horse of the guard, fell in at the close of the evening with a column of English infantry on their march, sabred a number of soldiers, and carried disorder into the columns.—Gen. Lefebvre, Disnonettes, colonel of the chasseurs of the guard, detached two days before, with three squadrons of his regiment, having taken a quantity of baggage, of women, and stragglers, and finding the bridge of Ezela cut down, imagined that the town of Benavonte was evacuated. Carried away by that impetuosity with which the French soldiers have been so often reproached, he swam across the river, in order to make for Benavente, where he fell in with the whole of the cavalry of the rear-guard of the English : a long contest here ensued, of 400 men against 2000. There was no resisting numbers. Those brave fellows recrossed the river. The horse of gen. Lefebvre was killed by a ball. He had himself received a wound from a pistol shot, and, being dismounted, was made prisoner. Ten of his chasseurs, who had also been dismounted, were likewise taken, 5 were drowned, and 20 were wounded. This sharp affair must have convinced the English what they would have to dread from such men in general action ; gen. Lefebvre undoubtedly committed a fault, but it was the fault of a Frenchman ; he ought to be blamed and rewarded at the same time. The number of prisoners taken from the enemy, up to the present moment, and who are chiefly composed of scattered individuals and stragglers, amounts to 300.—On the 28th the head-quarters of the Emperor were at Valderas ; the head-quarters of the duke of Dalmatia at Manilla, the duke of Elchingen at Villatora. On his departure from Madrid, the Emperor appointed king Joseph his lieut.-general, with the command of the garrison of the capital, together with the corps of the dukes of Dantzic and Belluno ; the divisions of cavalry of Lasalle, Milhaud, and Latour Maubourg,

are left for the protection of the centre.—The weather is exceedingly bad. To a piercing cold, heavy and continued rains have succeeded. We suffer, but the English must suffer still more.

#### *Twenty-Second Bulletin.*

Benavente, Dec. 31.—On the 30th, the cavalry, commanded by the duke of Istria, passed the Ezela. On the evening of the 30th, it traversed Benavente, and pursued the enemy as far as Puenta de la Vilana. On the same day the head-quarters were established at Benavente. The English were not satisfied with destroying an arch of the bridge of Ezela, but they also blew up the buttresses with mines, a damage wholly unprofitable, and which could be hurtful only to the country; the rear betook themselves to the most shocking plundering. The soldiers, in the excess of their continual intemperance, gave reins to all the licentiousness of brutal inebriety. Every thing in their conduct bespoke rather an hostile army than one which came to the assistance of a friendly power.—The contempt of the English for the Spaniards gave a sharper edge to the impression made by so many outrages. This experience will throw a salutary damp on those insurrections, instigated by foreigners. One cannot help regretting that the English had not sent an army into Andalusia. The army that passed through Benavente ten days ago, triumphed already in hope, and already having their colours hung with trophies, nothing could equal the audacity and security they displayed. On their return, their countenance was sadly changed. They were harassed with fatigue, and seemed to be borne down with shame of retreating without a battle. In order to anticipate the just reproaches of the Spaniards, the English continued incessantly to repeat, that they had been promised to be joined by numerous forces; and the Spaniards repelled their calumnious assertions by arguments to which there was no answer.—Ten days ago, when the English were traversing the country, they well knew that the Spanish armies had been destroyed. The commissaries whom they employed to accompany the armies of the left, of the centre, and of the right, knew full well that it was not 50,000 men only, but 180,000 men that the Spaniards had put under arms; that these 180,000 men had fought, while, for six weeks, the English had remained unconcerned spectators of their struggles. These commissaries could not but have made it known

that the Spanish armies had ceased to exist. The English, therefore, could not be ignorant that the Spaniards were without armies. When, ten days ago, they again moved forward, intoxicated with the silly hope of deceiving the vigilance of the French general, they fell into the snare which the French general had laid for drawing them into the open country. They had before made some marches on their return to their ships.—You ought, observe the Spaniards, to have persisted in that prudent determination, or else you should have been in force enough to balance the destinies of the French. Above all, you ought not to have at first advanced with such confidence, only afterwards to fall back with so much precipitation. You should not have drawn the theatre of the war among us, and exposed us to the ravages of the two armies. After having brought down upon our heads such accumulations of disasters, you ought not to throw the fault upon us.—We have not been able to resist the French troops; nor do you seem more able to make head against them. Forbear therefore to accuse us, to outrage us—all our misfortunes we owe to you.—The English had reported throughout the country, that they had defeated 5000 of the French cavalry on the banks of the Ezela, and that the field of battle was covered with their dead. The inhabitants of Benavente were much surprised, upon visiting the field of battle, to have found there only three Englishmen and two French. That contest, of 400 men against 2000, does great honour to the French. During the whole of the 29th, the river continued to swell considerably, so that at the close of the evening it became impossible to ford it. It was in the middle of the river, and at the moment he was on the point of being drowned, that general Lefebvre, being carried away by the current to the side occupied by the English, was made prisoner. The loss of the enemy, in killed and wounded, in that affair of advanced posts, has been far greater than that of the French. The flight of the English was so precipitate, that they left at their hospital their sick and wounded, and were obliged to burn a fine magazine of tents and cloathing.—They killed all the horses that were over fatigued or wounded, and which might embarrass their retreat. It is scarcely here to be credited how that spectacle, so shocking to our manners, of hundreds of horses shot with pistols, is revolting to the Spaniards. Many persons look upon it as a

sort of sacrifice—some religious rite—which gives rise, in the mind of the Spaniards, to very strange pictures of the religion of England. The English are retreating in the utmost haste. All the Germans in their pay are deserting. Our army will, this evening, be at Astorga near the borders of Gallicia.

*Twenty-Third-Bulletin.*

Benavente, Jan. 1.—THE duke of Dalmatia arrived on the 30th December at Mancille, where was the left of the enemy, consisting of the Spaniards under gen. Romana. Gen. Franceschi overthrew them in a single charge, killed a great number, took two standards, and made prisoners a colonel, two lieut. colonels, fifty officers, and 1, 500 men.—On the 31st the duke of Dalmatia entered Leon, where he found 2000 sick. Romana succeeded Blake in the command, after the battle of Espnosa. The remains of that army, which, while before Bilboa, consisted of 50,000 men, were reduced to almost 5000 at Mancilla. These wretches, without clothes, and oppressed with every misery, filled the hospitals.—The English are held in detestation by these troops whom they despise, and by the peaceable inhabitants whom they abuse and whose substance they devour, in order to support their own army.—The mind of the people of the kingdom of Leon is much changed. They loudly cry out for Peace and their King; they curse the English and their fallacious insinuations. They reproach them with being the cause of the shedding of Spanish blood, in order to feed the English monopoly, and perpetuate the war on the continent. The perfidy of England and her motives are now obvious to the meanest and most illiterate Spanish peasant. They know what they suffer: and the authors of their sufferings are before their eyes.—Meantime the English retreat with the utmost haste, pursued by the duke of Istria, with 9000 cavalry. Among the magazines which they burnt at Benevente, were, independant of tents, 4000 blankets, and a great quantity of rum. We picked up upwards of 200 waggons of baggage and ammunition, left on the road from Benevente to Astorga. The shattered remains of Romana's army threw themselves into the latter town, and increased the confusion.—The events of the English expedition to Spain must furnish materials for a fine opening speech to the English Parliament. The English nation must be informed, that her army remained three months in a state of inaction, while it was

in their power to assist the Spaniards; that its leaders, or those whose orders they executed, have been guilty of the extreme folly of making a movement forward after the Spanish armies had been destroyed; that, in a word, it entered upon the new year by running away, pursued by an enemy, whom it did not dare to fight, and by the curses of those whom it had stirred up to resistance, and whom it was its duty to support. Such enterprizes and such results can belong only to a country that has no government. Fox, or even Pitt, would not have been guilty of such blunders. To contend against France by land, who has one hundred thousand cavalry, fifty thousand horses for all sorts of military equipment, and nine hundred thousand infantry, was, on the part of England, carrying folly to the utmost extreme; it betrays indeed a greediness for disgrace; it is, in fine, to administer the affairs of England just as the cabinet of the Thuilleries could wish them to be administered.—It betrays no small ignorance of Spain, to have imagined that any importance could be attached to popular commotion, or to indulge the smallest hope that by kindling in that country the flaines of sedition, such a conflagration could be attended with any decided result or any matériel duration.—A few fanatical priests are quite sufficient to compose and propagate libels, to carry a momentary disorder into the minds of men: but something else is required to cause a nation to rise to arms.—At the time of the French Revolution, it required three years and the presence of the convention to prepare the means of military successes; and who that does not know to what hazards France was nevertheless exposed? France was, however, stirred up. Supported by the unanimous resolution to reassert rights of which she had been deprived in times of obscurity. In Spain, it was a few men who stirred up the people, in order to preserve the exclusive possession of rights odious to the people. Those who fought for the inquisition, for the Franciscans, and for feudal rights, might be animated by an ardent zeal for their personal interests, but could never infuse into a whole nation a firm resolve or a permanent opinion. In spite of the English feudal rights, the Franciscans, and the inquisition, have no longer any existence in Spain.—After the capture of Rosas, gen. Gouvion Saint-Cyr shaped his march against Barcelona, at the head of the 7th corps. He dispersed every thing that he found before that place, and formed a junction with gen. Duhesme. That junction

brought his army to 40,000 men.—The dukes of Treviso and Abrantes have carried all the outworks at Saragossa. The gen. of engineers, Lacoste, is preparing the means of getting possession of that city without loss.—The king of Spain has gone to Aranjuez, in order to review the first corps, commanded by the duke of Belluno.

*Twenty-fourth Bulletin.*

Astorga, Jan. 2.—The Emperor arrived at Astorga on the 1st of Jan. The road from Benevente to Astorga is covered with dead horses belonging to the English, with travelling carriages, artillery, caissons and warlike stores. There were found at Astorga magazines of sheets, blankets, and the tools and implements of pioneers.—As to Romana's army, it is reduced almost to nothing. The small number that remain are without coats, shoes, pay, food, and it is no longer to be considered anything.—The Emperor has charged the duke of Dalmatia with the glorious mission of pursuing the English to the place of their debarkation, and of driving them into the sea, at the point of the sword.—The English will learn what it is to make an inconsiderate movement in presence of the French army. The manner in which they have been driven from the kingdoms of Leon and Galicia, and the destruction of a part of their army, will, no doubt, teach them to be more circumspect of their operations on the continent.—All that remains of the Spanish insurgent troops has been without pay for several months back.

BATTLE OF CORUNNA.—*London Gazette Extraordinary, dated Downing-street, Jan. 24, 1809.*

The hon. captain Hope arrived late last night with a dispatch from lieut.-gen. sir David Baird to lord viscount Castlereagh, one of his majesty's principal secretaries of state, of which the following is a copy:

His majesty's ship Ville de Paris, at sea, Jan. 18, 1809.—My Lord; By the much-lamented death of lieut.-general sir John Moore, who fell in action with the enemy on the 16th instant, it has become my duty to acquaint your lordship, that the French army attacked the British troops in the position they occupied in front of Corunna, at about 2 o'clock in the afternoon of that day.—A severe wound, which compelled me to quit the field a short time previous to the fall of sir John Moore, obliges me to refer your lordship for the particulars of the action, which was long

and obstinately contested, to the inclosed Report of lieut.-gen. Hope, who succeeded to the command of the army, and to whose ability and exertions in direction of the ardent zeal and unconquerable valour of his majesty's troops, is to be attributed, under Providence, the success of the day, which terminated in the complete and entire repulse and defeat of the enemy at every point of attack. The hon. capt. Gordon, my aid-de-camp, will have the honour of delivering this dispatch, and will be able to give your lordship any further information which may be required. I have the honour to be, &c. D. BAIRD, lieut.-gen.

His majesty's ship Audacious, off Corunna, Jan. 18, 1809.—Sir; In compliance with the desire contained in your communication of yesterday, I avail myself of the first moment I have been able to command, to detail to you the occurrences of the action which took place in front of Corunna, on the 16th instant.—It will be in your recollection, that about one in the afternoon of that day, the enemy, who had in the morning received reinforcements, and who had placed some guns in front of the right and left of his line, was observed to be moving troops towards his left flank, and forming various columns of attack at that extremity of the strong and commanding position, which, on the morning of the 15th, he had taken in our immediate front.—This indication of his intention was immediately succeeded by the rapid and determined attack which he made upon your division, which occupied the right of our position. The events which occurred during that period of the action you are fully acquainted with. The first effort of the enemy was met by the commander of the forces, and by yourself, at the head of the 42nd regt., and the brigade under major-gen. lord William Bentinck.—The village on your right became an object of obstinate contest.—I lament to say, that soon after the severe wound which deprived the army of your services, lieut.-gen. sir John Moore, who had just directed the most able dispositions, fell by a cannon-shot. The troops, though not unacquainted with the irreparable loss they had sustained, were not dismayed, but by the most determined bravery not only repelled every attempt of the enemy to gain ground, but actually forced him to retire, although he had brought up fresh troops in support of those originally engaged.—The enemy, finding himself foiled in every attempt to force

the right of the position, endeavoured by numbers to turn it. A judicious and well-timed movement, which was made by major-gen. Paget, with the reserve, which corps had moved out of its cantonments to support the right of the army, by a vigorous attack, defeated this intention. The major-general having pushed forward the 95th (rifle corps) and 1st battalion 52nd regiments, drove the enemy before him, and in his rapid and judicious advance, threatened the left of the enemy's position. This circumstance, with the position of lieut.-gen. Fraser's division, (calculated to give still further security to the right of the line) induced the enemy to relax his efforts in that quarter.—They were however more forcibly directed towards the centre, where they were again successfully resisted by the brigade under major-gen. Manningham, forming the left of your division, and a part of that under major-gen. Leith, forming the right of the division under my orders. Upon the left, the enemy at first contented himself with an attack upon our picquets, which however in general maintained their ground. Finding however his efforts unavailing on the right and centre, he seemed determined to render the attack upon the left more serious, and had succeeded in obtaining possession of the village through which the great road to Madrid passes, and which was situated in front of that part of the line. From this post, however, he was soon expelled, with considerable loss, by a gallant attack of some companies of the 2nd battalion 14th regiment, under lieut.-colonel Nicholls; before five in the evening, we had not only successfully repelled every attack made upon the position, but had gained ground in almost all points, and occupied a more forward line than at the commencement of the action, whilst the enemy confined his operations to a cannonade, and a fire of his light troops, with a view to draw off his other corps. At six the firing entirely ceased. The different brigades were re-assembled on the ground they occupied in the morning, and the picquets and advanced posts resumed their original stations.—Notwithstanding the decided and marked superiority which at this moment the gallantry of the troops had given them over an enemy, who, from his number and the commanding advantages of his position, no doubt expected an easy victory, I did not, on reviewing all circumstances, conceive that I should be warranted in departing from what I knew was the fixed and previous determination of the

late commander of the forces, to withdraw the army on the evening of the 16th, for the purpose of embarkation, the previous arrangements for which had already been made by his order, and were, in fact, far advanced at the commencement of the action. The troops quitted their position about ten at night, with a degree of order that did them credit. The whole of the artillery that remained unembarked having been withdrawn, the troops followed in the order prescribed, and marched to their respective points of embarkation in the town and neighbourhood of Corunna. The picquets remained at their posts until five in the morning of the 17th, when they were also withdrawn with similar orders, and without the enemy having discovered the movement.—By the unremitting exertions of captains the hon. H. Curzon, Gosselin, Boys, Rainier, Serrett, Hawkins, Digby, Carden, and Mackenzie, of the royal navy, who, in pursuance of the orders of rear adm. de Courcy, were entrusted with the service of embarking the army; and in consequence of the arrangements made by commissioner Bowen, captains Bowen and Shepherd, and the other agents for transports, the whole of the army were embarked with an expedition which has seldom been equalled. With the exception of the brigades under major-generals Hill and Beresford, which were destined to remain on shore, until the movements of the enemy should become manifest, the whole was afloat before day light.—The brigade of major-gen. Beresford, which was alternately to form our rear-guard, occupied the land front of the town of Corunna; that under major-Gen. Hill was stationed in reserve on the promontory in rear of the town.—The enemy pushed his light troops towards the town soon after eight o'clock in the morning of the 17th, and shortly after occupied the heights of St. Lucia, which command the harbour. But notwithstanding this circumstance, and the manifold defects of the place, there being no apprehension that the rear-guard could be forced, and the disposition of the Spaniards appearing to be good, the embarkation of maj.-gen. Hill's brigade was commenced and completed by 3 in the afternoon; maj.-gen. Beresford, with that zeal and ability which is so well known to yourself and the whole army, having fully explained, to the satisfaction of the Spanish governor, the nature of our movement, and having made every previous arrangement, withdrew his corps from the land front of the town soon after dark, and was,

with all the wounded that had not been previously moved, embarked before one this morning.—Circumstances forbid us to indulge the hope, that the victory with which it has pleased Providence to crown the efforts of the army, can be attended with any very brilliant consequences to Great Britain. It is clouded by the loss of one of her best soldiers. It has been achieved at the termination of a long and harassing service. The superior numbers, and advantageous position of the enemy, not less than the actual situation of this army, did not admit of any advantage being reaped from success. It must be however to you, to the army, and to our country, the sweetest reflection, that the lustre of the British arms has been maintained, amidst many disadvantageous circumstances. The army which had entered Spain, amidst the fairest prospects, had no sooner completed its junction, than owing to the multiplied disasters that dispersed the native armies around us, it was left to its own resources. The advance of the British corps from the Duero, afforded the best hope that the south of Spain might be relieved, but this generous effort to save the unfortunate people, also afforded the enemy the opportunity of directing every effort of his numerous troops, and concentrating all his principal resources for the destruction of the only regular force in the north of Spain.—You are well aware with what diligence this system has been pursued.—These circumstances produced the necessity of rapid and harassing marches, which had diminished the numbers, exhausted the strength, and impaired the equipment of the army. Notwithstanding all these disadvantages, and those more immediately attached to a defensive position, which the imperious necessity of covering the harbour of Corunna for a time had rendered indispensable to assume, the native and undaunted valour of British troops was never more conspicuous, and must have exceeded what even your own experience of that invaluable quality, so inherent in them, may have taught you to expect. When every one that had an opportunity seemed to vie in improving it, it is difficult for me, in making this report, to select particular instances for your approbation. The corps chiefly engaged were the brigades under major-generals lord Wm. Bentinck, and Manningham, and Leith; and the brigade of guards under major-gen. Warde.—To these officers, and the troops under their immediate orders, the greatest praise is due. Major-gen.

Hill and col. Catlin Crawford, with their brigades on the left of the position, ably supported their advanced posts. The brunt of the action fell upon the 4th, 42d, 50th, and 81st regiments, with parts of the brigade of guards, and the 26th regiment. From lieut. col. Murray, quarter-master-general, and the officers of the general staff, I received the most marked assistance. I had reason to regret, that the illness of brigadier-general Clinton, adjutant-general, deprived me of his aid. I was indebted to brigadier-general Slade during the action, for a zealous offer of his personal services, although the cavalry were embarked.—The greater part of the fleet having gone to sea, yesterday evening, the whole being under weigh, and the corps in the embarkation necessarily much mixed on board, it is impossible, at present, to lay before you a return of our casualties. I hope the loss in numbers is not so considerable as might have been expected. If I was obliged to form an estimate, I should say, that I believe it did not exceed in killed and wounded from seven to eight hundred; that of the enemy must remain unknown, but many circumstances induce me to rate it at nearly double the above number. We have some prisoners, but I have not been able to obtain an account of the number; it is not, however, considerable. Several officers of rank have fallen, or been wounded, among whom I am only at present enabled to state the names of lieut.-col. Napier, 92d reg., majors Napier and Stanhope, 50th reg., killed; lieut.-col. Winch, 4th reg., lieut.-col. Maxwell, 26th reg., lieut-col. Fane, 59th reg., lieut.-col. Griffith, guards, majors Miller and Williams, 81st reg., wounded.—To you, who are well acquainted with the excellent qualities of lieut.-gen. sir John Moore, I need not expatiate on the loss the army and his country have sustained by his death. His fall has deprived me of a valuable friend, to whom long experience of his worth had sincerely attached me. But it is chiefly on public grounds that I must lament the blow. It will be the conversation of every one who loved or respected his manly character, that, after conducting the army through an arduous retreat with consummate firmness, he has terminated a career of distinguished honour by a death that has given the enemy additional reason to respect the name of a British soldier. Like the immortal Wolfe, he is snatched from his country at an early period of a life spent in her service; like

Wolfe, his last moments were gilded by the prospect of success, and cheered by the acclamation of victory ; like Wolfe, also, his memory will for ever remain sacred in that country which he sincerely loved, and which he had so faithfully served.—It remains for me only to express my hope, that you will speedily be restored to the service of your country, and to lament the unfortunate circumstance that removed you from your station in the field, and threw the momentary command into far less able hands. I have the honour to be, &c.—JOHN HOPE, lieut.-gen.

To lieut.-gen. sir D. Baird, &c. &c.

*Supplement to the London Gazette Extraordinary, dated Admiralty-Office, January 24, 1809.*

Copy of a Letter from the hon. Michael De Courcy, rear-adm. of the White, to the hon. William Wellesley Pole, dated on board his majesty's ship the 'Tonnant', at Corunna, the 17th and 18th instant.

January 17, 1809.—Sir : Having it in design to detach the Cossack to England as soon as her boats shall cease to be essential to the embarkation of troops, I seize a moment to acquaint you, for the information of the lords commissioners of the admiralty, that the ships of war, as per margin, [Ville de Paris, Victory, Barfleur, Zealous, Implacable, Elizabeth, Norge, Plantagenet, Resolution, Audacious, Endymion, Mediator,] and transports under the orders of rear-adm. sir Samuel Hood, and commissioner Bowen, arrived at this anchorage from Vigo on the 14th and 15th instant ; the Alfred and Hindostan, with some transports, were left at Vigo to receive a brigade of three thousand five hundred men, that had taken that route under generals Alten and Crawford.—In the vicinity of Corunna, the enemy have pressed upon the British in great force. The embarkation of the sick, the cavalry, and the stores, went on. The night of the 16th was appointed for the general embarkation of the infantry ; and mean time, the enemy prepared for attack. At three p.m. an action commenced ; the enemy, which had been posted on a lofty hill, endeavouring to force the British on another hill of inferior height, and nearer the town.—The enemy were driven back with great slaughter : but very sorry am I to add, that the British, though triumphant, have suffered se-

vere losses. I am unable to communicate further particulars, than that sir John Moore received a mortal wound, of which he died at night ; that sir David Baird lost an arm ; that several officers and many men have been killed and wounded : and that the ships of war have received all such of the latter as they could accommodate, the remainder being sent to transports.—The weather is now tempestuous, and the difficulties of embarkation are great. All except the rear-guard are embarked ; consisting, perhaps, at the present moment, of two thousand six hundred men. The enemy having brought cannon to a hill overhanging the beach, have forced a majority of the transports to cut or slip. Embarkation being no longer practicable at the town, the boats have been ordered to a sandy beach near the light-house ; and it is hoped that the greater part, if not all, will still be embarked, the ships of war having dropped out to facilitate embarkation.

Jan. 18. The embarkation of the troops having occupied the greater part of last night, it has not been in my power to detach the Cossack before this day ; and it is with satisfaction I am able to add, that, in consequence of the good order maintained by the troops, and the unwearyed exertions of commissioner Bowen, the captains and other officers of the navy, the agents, as well as the boat's crews, many of whom were for two days without food and without repose, the army have been embarked to the last man, and the ships are now in the offing, preparatory to steering for England. The great body of the transports having lost their anchors, ran to sea without the troops they were ordered to receive, in consequence of which there are some thousands on board the ships of war. Several transports, through mismanagement, ran on shore. The seamen appeared to have abandoned them, two being brought out by the boats' crews of the men of war, two were burnt, and five were bilged.—I cannot conclude this hasty statement without expressing my great obligation to rear-adm. sir Samuel Hood, whose eye was every where, and whose exertions were unremitting. I have the honour to be, &c. M. DE COURCY.

Hazy weather rendering the Cossack obscure, I detach the Gleaner with this dispatch.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 5.] LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1809. [Price 10d.

" 'Tis all a libel, Paxton, Sir, will say." POPE.

161]

[162

## SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

DUKE OF YORK.—Much as I wish to communicate to the public some information, some *really* authentic information, which I possess, respecting the disposition of the people of Spain, their behaviour towards our army, the manner in which the retreat was conducted, the superior bodily strength and the superior bravery of our troops; anxious as I am to communicate this information to the public, I must defer it till my next, the parliamentary discussion relative to our illustrious Commander in Chief imperiously demanding a preference to every thing else.—On last Friday, the 27th ult. Mr. WARDLE, a member of the House of Commons, who came into<sup>the</sup> the honourable house for the first time, I believe, in consequence of the dissolution in 1807, when his majesty was last “most graciously pleased to ap—“ peal to the sense of his people,” and for which gracious act the public will do me the justice to say, that I, at the time, expressed my profound gratitude, though I could not then possibly foresee a thousandth part of the good which has resulted from the dissolution. Mr. WARDLE, having before given due notice of his intention, did, on the day above-mentioned, after a speech of considerable length, make a motion “for the appointment of a Committee “to inquire into the conduct of the Commander “in Chief, with regard to Promotions and “Exchanges in the Army, &c. &c.” This is truly *high matter*; and, as it is also matter of great “delicacy,” as will be seen in the sequel, it will demand, from reader as well as writer, more than an ordinary degree of attention, to say nothing about the reverence, which, upon such an occasion, will naturally take and keep possession of our minds. The honourable persons, who spoke on the side of the Duke, and who, from what appears in the report, seem to have known his wish upon the subject, declared, that that wish was decidedly for *publicity*; that every part of the inquiry, from the beginning to the end, should be made as *public as possible*. In this respect, the public do, I am cer-

tain, perfectly coincide in wishes with the royal chief; and, therefore, though, in general, it is not desirable that reports of debates should be inserted in this work, I shall insert here the *whole* of this most interesting debate, or, rather conversation, of the honourable House. Upon comparing the reports in the different newspapers, I find the best, that is to say, the *fullest*, to be in the Morning Chronicle, as is, indeed, usually the case. I find very little difference as to the *substance*, the accuracy with which the debates are, in general, taken and published, being really wonderful, and a circumstance eminently creditable to the talents of the gentlemen, by whom those debates are given to the public. But, upon this important occasion, I will, as I proceed with the insertion of the debate from the Morning Chronicle, subjoin, in notes, parts of the report as given in the Courier, whenever it appears that there has been any material omission in the report of the Morning Chronicle; and thus we shall have the least possible chance of letting nothing of consequence escape us.—Mr. WARDLE’s speech, I find divided into distinct paragraphs. These I shall distinguish by numerical figures, which will facilitate the work of reference, a work which, in all human probability, we shall frequently have to perform, it being quite evident to me, that this is a matter, which is not only, at present, extremely interesting in itself, to the country in general, to all the payers of taxes, as well as to every man in the army; but, also a matter, the inquiries into which must, at a day more or less remote, produce important national consequences.—It may be thought, perhaps, by some, that it would be better for me to wait; to reserve my observations upon this debate, until it be seen whether Mr. WARDLE be able to substantiate his charges; especially as that may, perhaps, be known before this sheet can possibly reach the press. I am of a different opinion; because, whatever the result may be, there is much in the report, which appears to me loudly to call for that observation, with

which it is my intention to close this article; and because, from certain expressions therein contained, I think it may be reasonably supposed, that, if the observation is to go forth through the press, there is no time to be lost.—Having said this by way of preface, I shall proceed to insert the debate, just as I find it in the above-named newspapers, without the omission of a “*heav*,” or a “*laugh*.”

Mr. WARDLE rose, pursuant to his notice, and spoke to the following effect:

—I.—Fully aware, Sir, of the great importance of the subject I am about to submit to the consideration of the House, I most sincerely lament that my abilities are unequal to do it complete justice.—But yet I trust that an ardent zeal for the welfare of my country, supported by facts strong and incontrovertible, will enable me to surmount every difficulty, and eventually to rescue the state from the baneful influence of a power which has long been exercised for the worst of purposes, and which, in fact, tends to endanger our ultimate security. To stand forward the public accuser of a man so high in rank and so strong in influence as the Commander in Chief, may very naturally be deemed no less a bold than an arduous undertaking. But, however bold, however arduous it may be, being determined that no consideration of that nature shall ever induce any hesitation or wavering in the performance of my duty either upon this or upon any other occasion, my mind is fully made up for perseverance. In the resolution I have formed, it is but reasonable for me to calculate upon the concurrence and co-operation of this House and the country. For, at a crisis of peculiar peril, when the great, if not the only means of our safety may depend upon the judicious organization and able direction of our military force, every man in the community must feel a lively interest in the object which my motion has in view. I trust, therefore, his r. h. the duke of York will this night find, that however exalted his rank, however powerful his influence, the voice of the people, through their representatives, will prevail over corruption, and justice will be done to the calls of a long-suffering and meritorious body, to the best, to the vital interests of the people. In the course which I am pursuing, I feel conscious of no motive but that of a desire to serve my country, and I am confident that none other can be fairly ascribed to me. The conviction of my mind is, and for

some time has been, that unless the system of corruption that has so long prevailed in the military department be done away, this country may fall an easy prey to the enemy. Consistently, therefore, with any rational feeling of solicitude for my country, which involves my own connections and my family, it is impossible that I should sit silent, and allow the practices which have come to my knowledge, to be any longer concealed, from those who are so much interested in their character and tendency. It is upon these grounds, Sir, that I am urged to offer myself to your attention.—H.—The first point in the case which I have to state, relates to the Half-pay Fund, which is an establishment under the direction of the Commander in Chief. This fund arises out of the sale of commissions vacant by death; by the promotion of officers not allowed to sell; or by dismissals from the service. The power of the Commander in Chief over this fund was constituted, and intended, for the reward of merit, either by the appointment of meritorious officers to the commissions which so became vacant, or by selling them and applying the produce of such sales to the redemption of half-pay commissions, or to the Compassionate Fund. Here the power of the Commander in Chief over such produce ceases. If the commissions I have described are otherwise disposed of, the authority vested in the Commander in Chief is abused, and the objects of the Half-pay Fund are abandoned. Now, if I can shew that those commissions are appropriated to very different purposes, it will of course appear that such abuse and abandonment does take place—that merit is not rewarded—that the Half pay List is not reduced—that the Compassionate Fund is not assisted. For the purpose of shewing this, it is absolutely necessary to call the attention of the House to another establishment of the Commander in Chief’s, which is quite of a different complexion to that I have just mentioned. This establishment, which consisted of a splendid house in Gloucester-place, a variety of carriages, and a large retinue of servants, commenced in the year 1803, and at the head of it was placed a lady of the name of Clarke. As this lady forms a principal party in several of the facts which I have to cite, I am under the necessity, however reluctantly, to mention her name, as well as that of others, in order to make out a fair parliamentary basis for my motion, and to satisfy the House that I have not brought it forward

upon light grounds. In producing this satisfaction, I have no doubt of succeeding, and I assure the House, that I shall endeavour to avoid trespassing upon their time by the statement of more cases than appear to me necessary to the particular points which my motion embraces.—

III.—The first case to which I have to call your attention is that of capt. Tonyn, whom I understand to be an officer of merit, and in alluding to him upon this occasion, I beg it to be understood that I mean no reflection whatever upon his character. This officer, who held his captaincy in the 48th regt. of foot, was promoted to a majority in the 31st regt. according to the Gazette, on the 2d Aug. 1804. For such promotion, to which, no doubt, capt. Tonyn's professional merit entitled him to aspire, he was indebted to the influence of Mrs. Clarke; without which he might have long looked for promotion in vain. To Mrs. Clarke, capt. Tonyn was introduced by capt. Huxley Sandon, of the Royal Waggon Train; and the terms of agreement were, that Mrs. Clarke should be paid 500*l.* upon capt. Tonyn's majority being gazetted. In order to secure this payment it was arranged, that the amount should be lodged in the hands of a third person, as agent to the parties, and this agent was a Mr. J. Donovan, a surgeon, of Charles-street, St. James's-square. As I shall have frequent occasion to introduce this gentleman's name to-night, and may be obliged to resort to him hereafter, it seems right that I should present the House with some information about him. It appears that Mr. Donovan was appointed a lieutenant in the 4th Royal Garrison Battalion in the year 1802, and that he was afterwards promoted to the 11th Battalion. What the cause of this appointment and promotion was I have endeavoured to ascertain, but without success. I have however found, that the services of Mr. Donovan could not have been of a military nature. In fact since the day of his appointment in 1802, he has never joined his regiment. But there seems to be some reason for granting him a perpetual leave of absence, as he has been on constant duty in London. This gentleman was a member of the medical department of our army in the American war. If he deserved promotion, surely our medical staff is large enough to provide for him. What then could have taken him into the army? But to return to his pursuits in London.—The 500*l.* lodged with this gentleman was paid to Mrs. Clarke, by capt. Huxley Sandon, as soon as major

Tony was gazetted. Here it becomes necessary to observe to the House, that the regulated difference between a Company and a Majority is 1100*l.* which should have been appropriated as I before mentioned. But how does the affair stand? Mrs. Clarke gains 500*l.* and 1100*l.* are lost to the Half-pay Fund. This sum, however, of 500*l.* was paid by Mrs. Clarke to a Mr. Birket, a silversmith, in part payment for a service of plate for the establishment in Gloucester-place; *the balance for which plate was afterwards paid by h. r. h. the Commander in Chief.* The positions which I hold to be clearly deducible from this case are these—First, that Mrs. Clarke possessed the power of military promotion. Secondly, That she received pecuniary consideration for such promotion. And thirdly That the Commander in Chief was a partaker in the benefit arising from such pecuniary consideration. To establish the truth of this case, I have the following witnesses;—Major Tonyn, Mrs. Clarke, Mr. Donovan, capt. Huxley Sandon, and Mr. Birket's Executors.—IV.—These second case I have to adduce relates to the subject of exchanges. Upon the 23d of July 1805, an exchange was concluded between lieut.-col. Brooke, of the 56th regt. of Infantry, and lieut. col. Knight, of the 5th dragoon guards, through the influence of Mrs. Clarke. The agent for negotiating this transaction was a Mr. Thynne, a medical gentleman. The circumstances of the application to the duke of York were shortly these; Mrs. Clarke wanted some money to defray the expences of an excursion in the country; she therefore urged the Commander in Chief to expedite the exchange, as she was to receive 200*l.* for it. This urgent request was made upon a Thursday, and its influence was such that the exchange was actually gazetted upon the Saturday following. Mrs. Clarke in consequence received 200*l.* from the agent. This case then serves to shew—first, that, in addition to promotions, exchanges also were at the disposal of Mrs. Clarke; and secondly, that the purse of the Commander in Chief was saved by the supply which his mistress derived from such sources. The witnesses to this case are, lieut. col. Brooke, lieut. col. Knight, Mrs. Clarke, and Mr. Thynne.—V.—As a contrast to the preceding exchange, I shall take leave to state a case of peculiar hardship which occurred within the last year: two meritorious officers, major Macdonald and major Sinclair, both of the first regt. of infantry, and both in-

disposed, were anxious to make an exchange—the one desiring, for the recovery of his health, to remain in England; while the other, from a similar motive, desired to go to the West Indies. These gentlemen sought their object by every honourable means. The most urgent requests, and the most respectable recommendations were made in their favour, but in vain. No mistress was resorted to; no bribe of 200*l.* was offered; major Macdonald was forced to go to the West Indies, and fell immediately a victim to the climate; major Sinclair was forced to remain in England, and survived but a few months. Thus was the country deprived of two highly deserving officers.

—VI.—The fourth case I have to adduce refers to major John Shaw, of col. Champagne's Ceylon regiment. Major Shaw was appointed Deputy Barrack Master of the Cape of Good Hope upon the 3d of April, 1806, through the influence of Mrs. Clarke. It was known that this officer by no means enjoyed the favour of the duke of York; that in fact his royal highness entertained some prejudices against him. But these obstacles Mrs. Clarke easily contrived to overcome: for it was agreed to pay her 1,000*l.* for the major's appointment. The appointment was therefore made, and the major himself paid Mrs. Clarke 300*l.* Soon after, 200*l.* more were sent to Mrs. Clarke, by major Shaw's uncle, through Coutts's bank, and the payment was made by one of Mr. Coutts's clerks. The remaining 500*l.* however, was not paid; and when it was found not to be forthcoming, Mrs. Clarke was enraged, and threatened revenge. She actually complained to the Commander in Chief of major Shaw's *breach of contract*, and the consequence was that the major was soon after put on half-pay. I am in possession of several letters which passed upon this subject, from major Shaw and Mrs. Shaw, threatening both the Commander in Chief and Mrs. Clarke with public exposure, &c. if their complaints were not redressed, but in vain. In consequence of this business, I have been induced to examine the half-pay list, in order to see whether any similar reduction to that of major Shaw had taken place in the Barrack Department; but I have found no such thing. Such officers being, in fact, kept on full-pay, even on the home staff. This case of major Shaw was indeed the only instance I could find of such an officer being reduced to half-pay. The case of this officer then demonstrates, first, that Mrs. Clarke's

influence extended to appointments on the staff of the army, as well as to promotions and exchanges in the army itself; secondly, that the Commander in Chief punished an individual by reducing him from full to half pay, for non-performance of a nefarious contract with his mistress; thirdly, that the Commander in Chief was a direct party to all this shameful transaction. The witnesses to this case are, Mrs. Clarke, Mr. Shaw, uncle to major Shaw, Mr. Coutts's clerk, and Mrs. Shaw.—

VII.—I now come to the very novel case of colonel French and his levy. This officer was, through the influence of Mrs. Clarke, appointed by the Commander in Chief to conduct a levy in the years 1804-5. The colonel was introduced to Mrs. Clarke by capt. Huxley Sandon, and the condition upon which he obtained his appointment was, that Mrs. C. should have one guinea out of the bounty of each man raised, together with the sale or patronage of a certain number of the commissions. The agreement being concluded, it was communicated to, and approved of, by the Commander in Chief. Col. French was accordingly sent by Mrs. Clarke to the Horse Guards, and after many interviews, the levy was set on foot. As the levy proceeded, Mrs. Clarke received several sums of money from col. French, capt. Huxley Sandon, and a Mr. Corri. She also received 500*l.* from a Mr. Cockayne, who is a well known solicitor in Lyon's-inn, and a friend of capt. Huxley Sandon's.

—VIII.—But, to return for a moment to Mr. Donovan, the garrison-battalion lieutenant.—This gentleman, who was such a prominent agent in those transactions, was acquainted with an old officer, a Captain Tuck, whom he very strongly recommended to seek promotion; and to encourage him by a display of the facility with which it might be attained, he sent him a written scale of Mrs. Clarke's prices, for different commissions, which, in stating, I beg leave to contrast with the regulated prices of the Army:

<i>Mrs. Clarke's Prices.</i>	<i>Regulated Prices.</i>
A Majority	£. 900 - - - £. 2600
A Company	700 - - - 1500
A Lieutenancy	400 - - - 550
An Ensigncy	200 - - - 400

From this scale it appears, that the funds I have before alluded to lost, in an enormous ratio to the gain of Mrs. Clarke, or any other individual acting upon the same system.—IX.—Here I am to take leave of Mrs. Clarke. Here the scene closes upon her military negotiations;

and in what follows, the Commander in Chief alone is interested. It appears that his royal highness required a loan of 5000*l.* from col. French, and Mr. Grant, of Barnard's inn, promised to comply with the request in procuring the money, provided the Commander in Chief would use his influence and obtain payment to col. French of a balance due to him by government on account of the levy. This was promised, but the Commander in Chief failing to fulfil his part of the condition, the loan he required was not advanced, and 3000*l.* still remain due from government to col. French. The case of this levy shews, first, that Mrs. Clarke, in addition to promotions in the army, to exchanges, and appointments on the staff, possessed the power of augmenting the military force of the country; secondly, that in this case, as in all others, she was allowed to receive pecuniary consideration for the exercise of her influence; thirdly, that the Commander in Chief endeavoured to derive a pecuniary accommodation for himself independently of Mrs. Clarke's advantages. The witnesses in this case are colonel French, captain Huxley Sandon, Mrs. Clarke, Mr. Corri, Mr. Grant, capt. Tuck, and Mr. J. Donovan.—X.—The last case with which I shall at present trouble the House is that of capt. Maling. This gent. was appointed to an ensigncy in the 87th reg. on the 28th of Nov. 1805; to a lieutenancy in the same reg. on the 26th of Nov. 1806; and to a captaincy in the Royal African Corps, under the command of the duke of York's own secretary, col. Gordon, on the 15th of Sept. 1808. I have every reason to believe capt. Maling to be a very unexceptionable character, although I cannot help pronouncing the mode of his promotion as extremely exceptionable. But this promotion was effected through the influence of the favourite agent, Mr. Greenwood, in whose office Mr. Maling was a clerk, remaining at his desk while advanced in the army by such an extraordinary course—by a course which interfered with the interests, which superseded the rights of many meritorious officers who had long served in the army—who had fought and bled for their country. This Mr. Maling has also, I understand, had, while so promoted, some appointment of pay-master in Ireland. I would appeal to the candour of the House, to the common sense of any man or body of men, whether it be right, whether it be tolerable, that such an accumulation of favours should be conferred upon any individual without any claim of

professional merit, but merely through the operation of undue influence, while so many hundreds of truly deserving men are slighted and overlooked? I would ask, whether it be possible that our army can prosper—that its spirit can succeed, or its character be advanced, while such injustice is tolerated? But I will not dwell upon those points—it is quite unnecessary.

—XI.—The facts I have stated are such as must suggest such reflections to any man's mind. The House must feel the propriety, the necessity of grounding some proceeding upon such facts. The proceeding I propose will, I have no doubt, be acceded to. I am sure I have stated quite enough to induce the House to give me what I ask—I could state more if necessary. There is, indeed, one thing to which I cannot omit alluding. The House must be astonished indeed at the corruption of the times, when told, that there is at this moment a public office in the City for the Sale of Commissions, at the same reduced scale as that of Mrs. Clarke, and that the persons who manage this office stated in my presence that they were the agents of the present favourite mistress, Mrs. Carey. Indeed, these agents declared further, that they were also enabled to dispose of places both in Church and State, and that they did not hesitate to say, that they were employed by two of the first officers in the administration. But these are points to which I may, on a future day, feel myself more enabled to speak at large. The hon. member concluded with moving for the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the conduct of the Commander in Chief, with regard to Promotions and Exchanges in the Army, &c. &c.

Sir FRANCIS BURDETT seconded the motion.

The SECRETARY AT WAR said, that he did not rise to give any opposition to the motion. (*Hear, hear, from the Treasury Bench.*) If he did so, he would ill consult the wishes and worse consult the interests of the Commander in Chief\*. The facts which the hon. gent. had brought forward were of the most serious nature,

\* From a regard to the interests of the Commander in Chief, he felt *unfeigned satisfaction*, that, at length, an opportunity was afforded of instituting an effectual inquiry into the grounds of the various *calumnies and misrepresentations* which had, of late, been so industriously circulated against that illustrious personage.

and well deserved the attention of the House. He hoped the House would go into the inquiry, but listen to no charge unless it was clearly and distinctly stated. Charges on these or any grounds distinctly stated, his royal highness was ready to meet, and even *desirous* of going into the investigation. This, he believed, was all that was necessary for him to say in this stage of the business; but he requested the indulgence of the House while he made a few observations not foreign to the question. With regard to the private transactions stated by the hon. gent. he had never heard of them before, and therefore could not be prepared to give an answer. But he could contradict those that were stated to have occurred at the Horse Guards. The papers respecting the half-pay fund were before the House, and he had stated in his place, without being contradicted at the time, that his royal highness had given up a great part of his patronage for the benefit of that fund. It was needless to go into the facts, more particularly as a full inquiry would necessarily take place. He would only remark, that the thanks which the House had been conferring on the army reflected no small credit on the Commander in Chief. His gallant friend near him (sir Arthur Wellesley) might perhaps, state of what description the army was which the Commander in Chief had put into his hands. Could the army have achieved the great exploits, for which it had been distinguished, *if it had been ill-managed for a series of years.* It had been universally allowed, that to make courage available in the day of battle *discipline* was necessary; and it was well-known how much the Commander in Chief had attended to that object, which had rendered the army so formidable to the enemy. Another fact, to which it was important to allude, was the extreme order and regularity which had been introduced into the office of the Commander in Chief, which the inquiry would prove.

Sir ARTHUR WELLESLEY *rejoiced* that the honourable gent. had at length brought forward facts, to which a specific inquiry might be directed—and he *rejoiced* also, that the character of the Commander in Chief would not be the subject of that general sort of discussion, which sometimes took place in that House; but that every fact would be fully and fairly sifted. It had fallen to his lot to know how promotions were conducted in the office of the Commander in Chief, and he knew

that it was regularly recorded in that office who recommended the promotion, and the documents would be found there, so that all these transactions might be completely traced. With regard to the produce of the half-pay fund, the mode in which the money came into the office, and the mode in which it was issued, were recorded. Under these circumstances, he *rejoiced* that a committee was to be appointed, and he hoped they would make a special Report—so much with regard to the alledged facts; but he must observe, with respect to the removal of the Barrack Master of the Cape of Good Hope, that such removals were circumstances of common occurrence. The instance in question related to the establishment at Ceylon; and in foreign establishments, though the facts stated by the hon. gent. should be true, it constituted no ground of charge, for it was in the ordinary course of the service. With respect to the exchange between an officer going to the West Indies and one remaining here, the Commander in Chief would be in a most extraordinary situation if it was to be made a ground of accusation, that he had not consented to an arrangement tending to the convenience, perhaps to the benefit of individuals. As to one of these gentlemen dying here, and the other in the West Indies, if these general charges were to be listened to, it would be impossible for a person in his royal highness's illustrious station to conduct the business. The circumstances stated by the hon. gent. went to shew, that his royal highness, with a view to put a little money in his own pocket, had encroached upon the half-pay fund. But the House would recollect, that this fund was established by his royal highness, and the money furnished from the produce of commissions, which he might have given away *without any sale at all.* But the Commander in Chief gave up his own patronage, and saved to the public an immense sum—and yet he was charged with an embezzlement of this sort! But he was glad that a full enquiry was to take place. There was still one topic on which he would be to blame, if he did not say a few words—he alluded to the state of the army under his command last summer. He must say, that never was there an army in a better state as far as depended on the Commander in Chief, and he must further say, that if the army had not performed the service for which it was destined, the blame would

not have rested with the Commander in Chief, but with him—(*hear! hear!*) \*

Mr. YORKE observed, that he never listened to a charge more serious, and he had heard it with the greatest possible concern, both on account of the Commander in Chief, and the hon. gent. who had brought it forward, (*hear! hear!*) who took so *heavy a responsibility* upon himself. But he was glad that the House had come at last to some charges against h. r. h. the Commander in Chief in a tangible form. † Publications which he would treat as libels, (*hear! hear!*) had lately appeared against the Commander in Chief, and these had been circulated with a pertinacity hitherto unexampled. He was glad, therefore, that something was now brought forward in a tangible form, and he hoped the House would do its duty to itself, to the country, and to the ROYAL HOUSE OF BRUNSWICK—(*Loud cries of hear! hear!*); that blame might rest where it ought to be fixed, and that if there was no ground for these accusations, justice might be done to the Commander in Chief. And he sincerely hoped, that if the latter should turn out to be the fact—the hon. gent. would be enabled to acquit himself, by shewing at least, that there existed some probable reasons in support of the *heavy charge* which he had taken *upon himself*. For my own part, Mr. Yorke continued, I believe that there exists a CONSPIRACY of the most atrocious and diabolical kind against his royal highness (*loud cries of hear! hear!*)—founded on the JACOBINICAL spirit which appeared at the commencement of the French revolution; for though this spirit did not shew itself exactly in the same form as at first, when once raised it was not easily quelled, and it never could promote its views with better hopes of success than by TALKING down illustrious persons—(*hear! hear!*). It was the object to write down his royal highness—

\* If that army had not performed those services, which it had pleased that House to honour with its thanks, it would not have been their or the Commander in Chief's fault, but his own; and whatever enthusiasm they had felt, was the result of the *example* and *discipline*, afforded by the illustrious person at the head of the army.

† At length they could reach in a tangible shape some of those libels which had for some time past been more assiduously and pertinaciously circulated than at any former period in this country so prolific in libels.

it was no less so to write down all the establishments of the country. By means of the press, the liberty of which was so valuable, and the licentiousness of which was so pernicious, it appeared to be the design of the CONSPIRATORS to write down the military system through the Commander in Chief—the army through its generals, and other establishments through the persons most conspicuous in each—

[*The remainder of the Debate shall be given in my next.*] —————

Now, as I said before, we need not wait for this discussion, in order to be able to form a judgment upon certain very important points, introduced into this debate; because those points are quite distinct from the main subject of the debate.

Upon the statement of Mr. WARDLE no observation need be made. It consists of facts; not of declamation or loose assertion; but of specific facts, the truth or falsehood of which may be, and are to be, ascertained. I should, however, do great violence to my feelings, were I to suppress an expression of my admiration of the manly as well as the able manner, in which that statement was made. The speech was, at once, concise, plain, and impressive; the allegations were unequivocal, the motives undisguised, and the principles such as do honour to the heart of the speaker; such principles as a great majority of us entertain, but such as very few of us indeed, have the courage to avow. There was no hypocrisy in the speech; no affected solicitude that the charges might prove false. The persuasion in the mind of the speaker evidently was, that he was stating truths; and, accordingly, he appeared to be afraid of nobody. The Morning-Post news-paper calls it “*a curious speech.*” If by “curious,” he, the editor, means *rare*, I must confess that it was “*curious*” in the highest degree.

As to the reported and published speeches of the other speakers, the first thing that struck me was, that they should have contained any thing at all, except what might relate to *the mode of inquiry*. The charges were so clearly stated, that there seemed to be nothing to do but, at once, to fix upon the mode of inquiring into them. However, it appeared to be an occasion for many persons to express their opinions relating to the person accused, and, therefore, we will notice what they said, it being desirable that nothing

should escape publicity that belongs to this important subject.

A direct denial of the facts does not appear to have been made by any one; but, the Secretary at War (general sir James Pulteney, who marched against *Ferrol*, as the reader will remember) said, that, as a proof that the army had not been badly managed, as a proof that the Duke of York had not abused his powers, the excellent *discipline* of our army might be cited, and for the proof of the goodness of that discipline, he referred to sir Arthur Wellesley. Sir Arthur, who appears to have been seated near sir James, bore testimony to the excellence of this discipline; imputed, in part, to the Duke, that valour the consequence of which had recently been a subject of the thanks of the House; and concluded by saying, that, whatever *enthusiasm* the army had felt was the result of the *example* and discipline afforded by the illustrious person at the head of the army. Mr. Yorke said, that, at the time when the Duke took the army in hand, it was in such a state as *scarcely to deserve the name of an army*.—Now, whatever others may think of the matter, I do not believe, that any, even the smallest portion, of the strength or the bravery of my countrymen is to be ascribed to the Duke of York, to any branch of the government, or to any other cause than that which proceeds from nature. I look upon steady courage; upon a temper to resist or attack without trepidation; to bear up when they come to the pinch; I look upon these as qualities *natural* to the people of this kingdom; nor will I, upon any account, give my assent, express or tacit, to any assertion leading to a contrary conclusion. But, the ascribing of the *enthusiasm* of the English soldiers at Vimiera to *discipline* is what I cannot understand. *Discipline* consists of *restraints*, at least; generally it implies checks, pains and penalties. Discipline may, and does, produce prompt *obedience*, *salmission*, and, of course, *order* and *regularity*; but, that it should fill the soul with *enthusiasm* is, to say the least of it, something wonderful. “*Example*,” indeed, may inspire an army with *enthusiasm*; and as to the probable effect of the *Duke of York’s example*; the *example* afforded by his *battus*; as to this, I am sure, it is quite unnecessary for me to say one word to any living creature in this kingdom.—After all, however, what has this to do with the main subject; the great subject now before the parliament and the public? Suppose we were to admit, that the men

of the 50th regiment, when they were making that gallant charge at Vimiera, before which the French instantly ran like a flock of sheep; suppose we were to admit, that the brave private dragoon, who took general Lefebvre; suppose we were to admit, that our regiments before Corunna, who, when engaged against triple their force, in point of numbers, and who, at the end of a march that had left even the officers barefooted, stood like a wall before the enemy, and when they saw fresh numbers pouring down, gave three huzzas, rushed forward upon the gathering host, drove them up the hill, and by that act of almost unexampled bravery secured the safety of the embarkation: suppose we were to admit, that all these men were inspired solely by the “*example*” of the Duke of York. Nay, suppose we were to admit, to its full extent, the idea of Mr. Yorke; suppose we were to admit, that it was the Duke who alone had rendered the English soldiery worthy the name of an army; that he, and he alone, had poured courage into the breasts of Britons, and had given them strength of bone and of sinew. Suppose we were to admit all this, and, I think, it is hard if a broader admission could be demanded, or wished for, even by the most zealous Anti-jacobin in the country; suppose we were to admit all this, what would the admission make; of what weight would it be; how would it at all alter the case, when set against facts such as those stated by Mr. Wardle? The *skill* and the *courage* of the Duke of York are things which appear to me to have nothing at all to do with his mode of distributing promotion. Nothing at all to do with those bargains and sales mentioned by Mr. Wardle. Mr. Wardle plainly stated, that Mrs. Clarke, with the connivance of the Duke of York, had received so much a head upon a new levy. Is this to be answered by citing the *military renown* of the Duke of York? Mr. Wardle states, that a man was going through a long course of military promotion and pay, while he was actually a clerk in the agent, Greenwood’s, office. Is this to be answered by telling us, that our army fought well at Vimiera? No, no. Such facts are to be efficiently met by nothing short of *flat denial*; and, unless they can be so met, at once, it were much better to wait the want of proof on the part of those, from whom the accusation has proceeded.

There was another *argument*, made use of by Mr. Adam, which does not seem to

me to be much more conclusive as to the main point. It was this: that he had, for 20 years past, had an intimate knowledge of the pecuniary concerns of the Duke of York; that he had been acquainted with all his embarrassments (of the *cause* of which, however, he did not speak); that, in all his transactions with the Duke, he had found him extremely unreserved, fair, and correct; that he never heard of any concerns with Mrs. Clarke and the like; that he thought he must have heard something of them, if they had had any existence; and that, *therefore*, the accusation must be false. The report of Mr. Adam's speech must, certainly, be incorrect; for, it is incredible, that a gentleman, who is so well able to reason, and who has so long been accustomed to weigh arguments with such nicety, should have drawn, either expressly or by inference, so illogical a conclusion; a conclusion destroyed, at once, if we perceive, that it proceeds solely upon premises, which are *matter of opinion*. All that Mr. Adam *asserts positively*, I, for my part, who have good reason to know and be grateful for his wisdom and integrity, implicitly believe; but, there may, without any impeachment of any of the excellent qualities of his head or heart, be great doubts with respect to the fact, whether, if an illicit commerce in commissions existed, he would necessarily hear of it; nay, it may be thought, that he would be amongst the *last men* in the world who would be made acquainted therewith.

The next point that presents itself is that of the "*heavy responsibility*," to which it was said, that Mr. Wardle had *subjected* himself. Almost all the honourable members, who spoke in praise of the Duke of York, used some phrase or other expressive of their *pleasure* at what Mr. Wardle had done. The Secretary at War declared his great *satisfaction* at it; Sir Arthur Wellesley *rejoiced* three times and was glad once; Mr. Yorke was glad twice and once happy; and Mr. Canning congratulated the Duke of York upon the matter being brought forward. This cannot fail to give the country a high opinion of the independence and love of impartial justice in these gentlemen. Yet, somehow or other, they did, most of them, seem to be deeply impressed with a *risk*, of some sort, that Mr. Wardle ran, from having performed this pleasure-giving task. Mr. Yorke called it a "*heavy responsibility*"; and Mr. Canning said, that "*infamy* must attach, either upon the accused or the *accuser*." If Mr. Canning meant, by the accuser, the *in-*

*former*, I agree with him; but, not so, if he meant Mr. Wardle; for, if that were to be admitted, what would become of the characters of Attorneys and Solicitors, high as well as low, who prefer accusations against men, who are acquitted? Will Mr. Canning say, that "*infamy*" attached to sir John Scott (now lord Eldon), because Mr. Horne Tooke was, upon a charge of treason preferred by sir John, *proved to be innocent of the charge*, being acquitted by a jury, which acquittal corresponded with the charge of a most learned and upright judge? No. Mr. Canning will not say this. It must, however, not only be said, but *proved*, before it will be admitted, that "*infamy*" will attach to Mr. Wardle, though his charges against the Duke should, like those against Mr. Horne Tooke, finally appear, from the best possible evidence, to be false: except, indeed, it should be made appear, that the charges *originated* with Mr. Wardle; that he *hatched* the facts; that he has *hired and bribed spies and informers*; that, in short, he has formed a conspiracy to injure, by base means, the reputation of the accused person. Mr. Yorke qualified his phrase of "*heavy responsibility*" by afterwards saying, that he hoped Mr. Wardle had, at least, "*probable grounds*" for what he had done. This was right; and, giving to Mr. Canning's words the application above-pointed out, I agree with them; but, if "*infamy*" were to attach to a member, who failed to prove a case put into his hands, the House of Commons would be in a pretty situation. "*The freedom of debate*" would soon be reduced to a level with another sort of freedom, of which we shall speak by-and-by. Suppose a case of a different nature. Suppose a good, honest, well-meaning member of parliament to be informed, that there is, even at this late day, a plot against the life of the king, and for the purpose of overturning "*the monarchy*," upsetting "*regular government*," overthrowing "*social order*," and blowing up "*our holy religion*," and that the conspirators (names this and that) with all their books and papers, all their bloody and anti-christian implements, were at that moment hard at work in some garret in St. Giles's. Suppose this; suppose the good man to inform the House of it; suppose the king's messengers, the police magistrates, the horse guards, dispatched to the scene of brooding destruction, with an order to bring to the bar every creature there found; and, suppose the conspira-

tors to consist of a poor old woman and her cat. Would it be fair, would it be just, to say that *infamy* attached to the good hoaxed gentleman? No. He might be reasonably enough laughed at for his credulity; but, even the parties accused could not justly charge him with *infamy*. In this case of Mr. Wardle, as in all other cases of a similar nature, the blame, if any, must be in proportion to the want of grounds, not for the *charges themselves*, but for *his belief of them*; and, therefore, however the *proof* may turn out, if it appear, that Mr. Wardle did receive information of the facts, which he has stated; that the informants are persons whose oath would be taken in a court of justice, and be sufficient for the hanging of any one of their neighbours in common life; and especially if it should be proved, that, amongst these informants, there be one, or more, of character so respectable as to have lived in habits of intimacy with the person accused; if *this* should be made appear, the public will, I am of opinion, agree with me, that, so far from any blame attaching to Mr. Wardle, he would have been guilty of a scandalous neglect of his duty, if he had refused, or delayed, to do what he has done.

I now come to a part of the debate, to which I must beg leave earnestly to crave the reader's most serious attention; after which allusion he will readily conclude that I mean that part which relates to an existing CONSPIRACY in this country. Not an imaginary thing like the one above supposed; but a real conspiracy, for the purpose, as Mr. Yorke described it, of *talking and writing down* the Duke of York, and, through him, and the Generals of the army, *the army itself*; of talking and writing down *all the establishments of the country*; which description, with somewhat of limitation, appears to have been repeated by Mr. Canning and Lord Castlereagh.—Coming from such high and grave authority the statement demands our attention. We have, indeed, seen publications in some of the news-papers, stating something about an existing design, in certain persons, to overthrow “social order;” to undermine, at the instigation of the devil, our happy constitution in church and state; and, we have lately seen, a stupid author, in a dirty pamphlet about Jacobinism, addressed to the Earl of Lonsdale, hammering his brains, to shew, that the Edinburgh Reviewers have formed a plan, a regular system, for effecting this wicked purpose, by the means of their Review, which, to

the regret of all those who admire excellent and most powerful writing, is published only four times a year, and which work, in only one single article upon the subject of the Methodistical doctrines, has done more good to the country, than all the writings of all the trading Anti-Jacobins, than all the hundreds and thousands of volumes, all the wagon-loads and ship-loads of printed trash, that have issued upon, and disgusted the world, from this, at once, vapid and polluted source. From this abundant, this overflowing tide, this Nile of venality, corruption, filth, falsehood, venom, and all uncharitableness, we have heard it asserted, that a Jacobinical conspiracy is in existence, and accordingly, to the assertion we have turned a deaf ear. But, now, when it is made in parliament; when it comes from such high authority, we must not only give it belief, but must accompany that belief with our regret, that the important, the awful, truth, was not sooner officially proclaimed, and that it should have been kept back until the moment, when *distinct charges* of corruption and profligacy, of the very worst sort, were, however unjust they may finally appear, made, *by a member of parliament*, against the person, at whose reputation the “CONSPIRATORS” are said to be levelling their most deadly shafts.—That the conspiracy does exist, and has, for some months (I think, that's it) existed, there can, however, be *now* no doubt; that it has an existence, not like the *real* presence in the wafer; not a legerdemain or metaphorical existence; nothing of priesthood or law-fiction about it; but, that there is, in England (oh! poor England), amongst the dwellings of John Bull, at this very time, without any mental reservation, a Jacobinical Conspiracy; a conspiracy of corporeal beings, for the purpose, as lord Castlereagh expressed it, “of overthrowing the monarchical branch of the Constitution.”—Mr. Yorke must understand these things better than we, in the country, do; but, to us, a *talking conspiracy* is something new, and calls to my mind Dennis's admirable criticism upon the tragedy of Cato. “What, the Devil!” says lie, “are your conspirators come “here again, to hold, aloud, treasonable “dialogues in Cato's own hall?” The man, who, in one of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays, is apprehended as a conspirator, when his real sin is mere gluttony, is accused upon the ground of his half-uttered sentences, while in eager search for a

cod's head instead of that of his sovereign. And, indeed, the great characteristic of conspirators heretofore has been that of cautiousness, and silence; but, as we are now assured, from such high authority, that there is actually a *talking* conspiracy on foot, it becomes us all to put a *bridle* in our mouths, that "we offend not with our tongue."—As to the writing part of the conspiracy, I have, I must confess, observed things that appeared to me to lean this way; and upon reading the debate, above inserted, I looked over the Courier news-paper, from the *eleventh* to the *twenty-sixth* of this month, comprising a space of fifteen days, or half a month. The following are amongst the Jacobinical productions that I found, and I lay them before a public, that, I am sure, will participate in the abhorrence which I entertain of the mean and villainous miscreants, from whose pens they proceeded.

**O**NE HUNDRED POUNDS in a Banker's hands ready to be advanced to any *Lady* or *Gentleman* who will procure the Advertiser a permanent situation in the Stamp-Office or Customs adequate. The greatest SECRECY may be relied upon. A line addressed, post-paid, to J. Smith, "the Rose and Crown, Wimbledon, will meet due attention."

**F**ROM FIVE HUNDRED to ONE THOUSAND POUNDS, will be presented to any Gentleman or *Lady*, who can obtain or procure for the Advertiser, an adequate and permanent Situation or Place under Government, in Town, or a few Miles from it.—For Integrity and Trust, Testimonials of Character and Respectability can be had, &c. &c. Letters addressed to J. P. L. Peele's Coffee-house, will meet due and secret attention."

**O**NE THOUSAND POUNDS will be given by a Gentleman to any Person having interest to procure him a respectable Situation under Government.—Direct to A. B. at Mr. West's, Bookseller, No. 81, Great Porland-street, Mary-le-bone."

**C**OUNTRY PATRONAGE. Any Gentleman enabled by Resignation or otherwise, to present the Advertiser with a permanent Situation, in the Country only, may be treated with, by addressing a Letter, post-paid, to L. P. C. Mr. Lauman, Taylor, St. James's-street, London."

Now, the manifest object of the persons making these publications, must be to cause it to be believed, that the places under go-

vernment are to be *bought and sold*, pretty much in the same way as beef or mutton. There are about twelve daily papers in London, and if we reckon on the above standard, at *eight*, a month, for each paper, it will make 1,152 of these publications in a year; publications, each of which amounts to an assertion, that, at least, in the opinion of the writer, the offices under the government, the salaries of which ought to go to pay for services to the public, are sold, and the price put into the pockets of such women or men as can procure the bestowing of the places.—These, indeed, are writings that tend to the destruction of "the monarchical branch of the Constitution;" and, how it happens that *they* have never been noticed, I must leave the reader to find out.—Oh! the sad rogues! They would persuade us, that they can *buy*, actually deal for, cheapen, and buy, for a sum of money, to go into the pocket of some woman, these very salaries which we pay for the doing of the nation's business! If this is not striking at "social order" and "regular government," I should be glad to know what is.—

—Mr. PERCEVAL, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, said, as will be seen by referring to the debate, that "it was not for him to tell the house, that, in this great capital, it might happen that foolish persons were frequently deceived by advertisements in the public papers, announcing the disposal of official patronage; and, perhaps, it has, occasionally, TURNED OUT, that the very persons, who were originally DECEIVED by these advertisements to make applications, did ultimately obtain the very appointments for which they had endeavoured to negotiate."

—Eh? . . . How's that? . . . Yes! I see it now; I see it now, as clear as daylight. Aye, aye; that is plain enough. It is just as Mr. Perceval said. Foolish people, seeing places advertised for sale, were deceived by them; but, it occasionally turned out, that these same foolish and deceived people did, in the end, get those very places, which the advertisements invited them to purchase.—This explanation cannot, I should hope, fail to produce a very salutary effect.

The last part of the debate, upon which I think it necessary, at present, to make any remark, is that which related to *libels* and the *liberty of the press*. I have so recently discussed this subject, that it is quite irksome to return to it; yet, what was said in the debate, especially by Mr. Yorke and Mr. Canning, strongly urges me to say

somethings, though it be mere repetition.—Both these gentlemen said, that there had been a series of libels published against the duke of York; which may be very true; and, if they mean *falschood* as an essential ingredient to constitute a libel, no man in all the world can wish the libellers to be punished more sincerely than I do; though I cannot help repeating what I have a thousand times said, that I do not think, that an aspersion upon the character of any man, was ever wiped off by an appeal to the law. No man ever practised what he preached more strictly than I do this doctrine. I have been, for about thirteen years, and am at this very day (see the Morning Post of Monday last,) the object of almost continual printed calumny. Not calumny conveyed in *inuendoes*, but in downright charges of the most infamous nature. I do not think, that there is a crime known to man, that I have not, either in America, or at home, been charged with. Knowing them to be false, those charges never gave me a moment's uneasiness. Once in a while, I have given a contradiction to lies, and have exposed misrepresentations. Trusting to the force of truth, I have, for the most part, left falsehood and malice to work their way; and, I do not believe, that in the opinion of one single sensible man that ever even heard of me, I have suffered, in the smallest degree, by the publications that have been made against me; and, as for fools, it is no matter what are their opinions.—But, there were two positions, one from Mr. Yorke and the other from Mr. Canning, to which I am disposed to pay particular attention.—The first of these gentlemen said, that libels had, of late, been more abundant, *against persons in authority*, than at *any former period*, in this country, so fertile in libels; and the latter said, that, in publications, *rank* ought to be regarded like sex, and that, to assail persons of exalted rank, was an act of baseness and cowardice, equal to that of assaulting a defenceless woman.—Mr. Canning may have been misrepresented by the reporters; they may not have caught his meaning; but, if they did, that meaning is decidedly hostile to my sentiments upon the subject; nay, it is the very reverse of those sentiments. There was much said about the “*blessings* of a “*free press*;” but, if it be to be regarded as an act of baseness to assail men of rank, I should be glad to know in what those “*blessings*” consist? The “*freedom of the press*” means, the freedom of ex-

amining and exposing the actions of *public men*; men who are entrusted with the nation’s affairs; and these are necessarily men of high rank. If the “*freedom of the press*” has not this meaning, it has no meaning at all, and all the talk about it is nonsense; and, therefore, according to this new doctrine, to use the freedom of the press at all, is an act of baseness and cowardice. Of all bad, or despicable, qualities, that of *cowardice* is the last that I should have expected to hear imputed to an unsupported individual, who assails men in power. Cowardice might, indeed, well be imputed to those, who, supported by the powerful, should send their publications forth like a mail coach, under government protection. To those, who, thus backed, should assail individuals, pour out upon them all sorts of calumnies, having no dread of punishment, cowardice may well be imputed. Here the charge of cowardice is due; for, not only would the calumniator be pretty secure from the dangers to which the opponents of men in power are exposed; but, worst come to worst, he would be sure of a compensation for his pains and his losses.—I have never yet got any answer to this question: “*What is freedom of the press?*” I want an answer to this question from some one of those, who talk of the “*licentiousness of the press*.” It does not consist in publishing books upon planting, farriery, or fox-hunting. There is not a despot upon earth, who attempts to prevent such publications. In short, it is farcical to talk about freedom of the press, unless by it we mean the *right*, the acknowledged *legal right*, of freely expressing our opinions, be they what they may, respecting the character and conduct of men in power; and of stating any thing, no matter what, if we can prove the *truth* of the statement.—In this sense the freedom of the press is a great “*blessing*.” In this sense it is “*a terror to evil doers, and a reward to those who do well;*” but, if the freedom of the press means, that we are not to assail men in power; that they are to be as sacred from the quill as women are from the sword; while, on the other hand, the press is to *praise* them as much as it pleases; then, the “*freedom of the press*” is the greatest curse that ever fell upon a nation. It is in the character and conduct of *men in power* that the public are interested. These are the *very matters*, upon which they want, and ought to receive information. The babble of the day is of no public utility. The particulars of who,

walks or rides out with the king ; of where and when the Duke of York salutes his royal parents ; of the breakfasts and dances at Frogmore ; of generals Cartwright and Fitzroy's going to chapel and hearing a sermon ; of the cabinet and other grand dinners : these may amuse some few gossipping people ; but of what use are they to the nation ? Of full as little use are dissertations containing merely general principles, without a direct application of them to men and things of the present day.

—But, we are sometimes told, that we *may* discuss the characters and measures of men in power, taking care not to *hurt their feelings* ; that is to say, taking care never to *blame* either the men or the measures ; for, if blamed, it follows of course, that their feelings *must be hurt*. We have been talked to a great deal about *decency* in these discussions ; and we are now told, that we, of this day, are *abusive* ; indeed, *censure*, or even *disapprobation*, however expressed, is now-a-days, always called abuse. We are charged, too, with being *foul-mouthed* ; *coarse* ; *personal* ; and are accused of *surpassing in libellousness the writers of all former times*. These assertions have been often made ; but now, at a moment when there are so many persons under government prosecution for libels ; now, when all the venal writers seem to have formed a conspiracy against the character, and, perhaps, the lives of those prosecuted persons, by exciting in the mind of those who are to be their jurors, a prejudice against them ; now it is absolutely necessary to inquire into the truth of such assertions.—The writers of former times ; times when not a thousandth part of the present corruptions prevailed ; the writers (from some of whose works I am forming a collection to be published hereafter) who, in those times of comparative purity, surpassed in boldness, the writers of the present day ; the bare names of those writers would fill a volume. I will, however, content myself with some extracts from Pope, who was one of the greatest scholars, the most acute reasoners, the most independent and virtuous men, and, without exception, the brightest geniuses that England ever produced. When he wrote, in the last reign, and in the year 1733, the laws and constitution of England were as well understood as they now are, and loyalty was not less a virtue than it now is. *Corruption* (under the administration of sir Robert Walpole) was only in its infancy. Now, then, let us hear how this accomplished scholar, this great ge-

nius, whose works are read with such admiration, and which make a part of the library of every man of sense who has the means of procuring books ; let us hear how this all-accomplished writer expressed himself upon the subject of the then prevailing vice and corruption.

Lo ; at the wheels of her triumphal car,  
Old England's Genius, rough with many a scar,  
Dragg'd in the dust ! his arms hang idly round,  
His flag inverted trails along the ground !  
Our youth, all liv'ry'd o'er with foreign gold,  
Before her dance : behind her, crawl the old !  
See thronging millions to the pagod run,  
And offer country, parent, wife, or son !  
Hear her black trumpet thro' the land proclaim,  
THAT NOT TO BE CORRUPTED IS THE SHAME.  
In soldier, churchman, patriot, man in pow'r,  
'Tis av'rice all, ambition is no more !  
See, all our nobles begging to be slaves !  
See, all our fools aspiring to be knaves !  
The wit of cheats, the courage of a whore,  
Are what ten thousand envy and adore :  
All, all look up, with reverential awe,  
At crimes that 'scape, or triumph o'er the Law ;  
While truth, worth, wisdom, duly they decry—  
*Nothing is sacred now but villainy.*

Yet may this verse (if such a verse remain)  
Shew there was one who held it in disdain.

This is only one instance. In many others he *named* the corrupt persons. But, Pope was called a “libeller ;” and, in his preface to that part of his inestimable works, from which the above extract is made, he observes, that “there is not in “the world a greater error, than that “which *fools* are so apt to fall into, and “*knaves* with good reason to encourage, “the mistaking a *satyrist* for a *libeller*.” He says, that the clamour raised on some of his former writings, induced him to bring before the public the writings of HORACE and DR. DONNE. With a similar view I now appeal to him, who exceeded them both in genius, and yielded to neither in any estimable quality. Having shown the public with what freedom those authors wrote, he next gives us his own sentiments upon what was, by the venal tribe of his day, called *libellous*, *gross*, *coarse*, *filthy*, *brutal*, *personal* and *sedition* ; and one cannot help being struck with the exact similarity in the clamours of that day and the clamours of this ; though, indeed, there is nothing wonderful in it, seeing that profligacy and corruption, being always the same in nature, must always have the same antipathies, as surely as vipers of the present day inherit the fears as well as the poison of their progenitors of a century ago.—Here, in the following extracts, we have all the old

grounds of clamour, together with the refutation and exposure. I beseech the public to abstract themselves from the poetry and the wit, and fix their attention wholly upon the reasoning. In it they will find an answer to all the cavilling and clamouring now in use by the conspirators against the real freedom of the press; and, I trust, they will join with me in sentiments of profound gratitude to the memory of the matchless author.

*Friend.* 'Tis all a libel, Paxton, Sir, will say.

*Pope.* Not yet, my friend! to-morrow, 'twill, it  
And for that very cause I print to-day. [may ;  
How should I fret to mangle ev'ry line,  
In reverence to the sins of *Thirty-nine*!  
Vice with such giant strides comes on amain,  
Invention strives to be before in vain;  
Feign what I will, and paint it e'er so strong,  
Some rising genius sins up to my song.

*Fr.* Yet none but you *by name* the guilty lash;  
Ev'n Guthry saves half Newgate by a dash.

Spare then *the person*, and expose *the vice*.

*P.* How, Sir! not damn the sharper, but the dice?  
Come on then, Satire! gen'ral, unconfin'd,  
Spread thy broad wing, and souse on all the kind.  
Ye statesmen, priests, of one religion all!

Ye tradesmen, vile, in army, court, or hall!

Ye rev'rend atheists. *Fr.* Scandal! *name them*,

Who?

*Po.* Why that's the thing you bid me not to do.  
Who starved a sister, who forswore a debt,  
I never nam'd; the town's enquiring yet.

The poi'sning dame. — *Fr.* You mean —

*I'o.* I don't. *Fr.* You do.

*Po.* See, now I keep the secret, and not you!  
The bribing statesman. — *Fr.* Hold, *too high*

*you go.*

*[too low.]*

*Po.* The brib'd elector. — *Fr.* There you stoop

*Po.* I fain would please you, if I knew with what;  
Tell me, which knave is lawless game, which not?  
Must great offenders, once escap'd the crown,

Like royal brats, be never more run down?

Admit your law to spare the knight requires,  
As beasts of nature may we hunt the squires?  
Suppose I censure—you know what I mean—

To save a Bishop, may I name a Dean?

*Fr.* A Dean, Sir? no; his fortune is not made;  
You hurt a man that's rising in the trade.

*Po.* If not the tradesman who set up to-day,  
Much less the 'prentice who to-morrow may.  
Down, down, proud Satire! th' a realm be

*spoil'd,*

Arraign no mightier thief than wretched *Wild*,  
Or, if a court or country's made a job,

Go drench a pickpocket, and join the mob.

But, Sir, I beg you (for the love of vice!)

The matter's weighty, pray consider twice;

Have you less pity for the needy cheat?

The poor and friendless villain, than the great?

Alas! the small discredit of a bribe

Scarce hurts the Lawyer, but undoes the Scribe.

Then better sure it Charity becomes

To tax Directors, who (thank God!) have plums;

Still better, Ministers; or, if the thing

May pinch ev'n there—Why, lay it on a King.

*Fr.* Stop! stop! — *Po.* Must Satire, then, nor  
rise nor fall?

*Speak out, and bid me blame no rogues at all.*

*Fr.* Yes, strike that *Wild*, I'll justify the blow.

*Po.* Strike? why the man was hang'd ten years  
ago :

\* \* \* \* \*

*Fr.* The Priest whose flattery be-dropt the  
crown,

How hurt he you? he only stain'd the gown.

And how did, pray, the florid youth offend,

Whose speech you took, and gave it to a friend?

*Po.* Faith, it imports not much from whom it  
came;

Whoever borrow'd, could not be to blame,

Since the *whole House* did afterwards the same.

Let courtly wits to wits afford supply,

As hog to hog in huts of Westphaly;

If one, thro' Nature's bounty, or his Lord's,

Has what the frugal, dirty soil affords,

From him the next receives it, thick or thin,

As pure a mess almost as it came in;

The blessed benefit, not there confin'd,

Drops to the third, who nuzzles close behind;

*From tail to mouth, they feed*, and they carouse:

The last full fairly gives it to the *House*.

*Fr.* This *filthy simile*, this *beastly line*! mine;

Quite turns my stomach—*Po.* So does *Flatt'ry*

And all your courtly civet-eats can vent,

Perfume to you, to me is excrement.

But hear me farther—Japhet, 'tis agreed, [read,

Writ not, and Chartres scarce could write or

In all the courts of Pindus guiltless quite; [write;

But pens can forge, my friend, that cannot

And must no egg in Japhet's face be thrown,

Because the deed he forg'd was not my own?

Must never Patriot then declaim at gin,

Unless, good man! he has been fairly in?

No zealous pastor blame a failing spouse,

Without a staring reason on his brows?

And each blasphemer quite escape the rod,

Because the insult's not on man, but God?

Ask you what provocation I have had?

The strong antipathy of good to bad.

When Truth or Virtue an affront endures,

Th' affront is mine, my friend, and should be

Mine, us a foe profess'd to false pretence, [yours.

Who think a coxcomb's honour like his sense;

Mine, as a friend to ev'ry worthy mind;

And mine as man, who feel for all mankind.

*Fr.* You're strangely prout.

*Po.* So proud, I am no slave :

So impudent, I own myself no knave;

So odd, my country's ruin makes me grave.

Yes, I am proud: I must be proud to see

Men not afraid of God, afraid of me :

Safe from the bar, the pulpit, and the throne,

Yet touch'd and sham'd by ridicule alone.

O sacred weapon! left for *Truth's* defence,

Sole dread of folly, vice, and insolence!

To all but Heaven-directed hands deny'd, [guide;

The muse may give thee, but the gods must

Rev'rent I touch thee! but with honest zeal,

To rouse the watchmen of the public weal,

To Virtue's work provoke the tardy Hall,

And goad the prelate shamb'ring in his stall.

Ye tinsel insects! whom a court maintains,

That count your beauties only by your stains,

Spin all your cobwebs o'er the eye of day,  
The Muse's wing shall brush you all away :  
All his Grace preaches, all his Lordship sings,  
All that makes *saints of queens, and gods of kings*. [Press,  
All, all but Truth, drops dead-born from the  
Like the *last Gazette*, or the *last Address*.  
\* \* \* \* \*

*Yes, the last pen for Freedom let me draw,*  
*When Truth stands trembling on the edge of Law;*

Here, last of Britons! let your names be read :  
Are none, none living? let me praise the dead,  
And for *that cause* which made your fathers  
Fall by the *Votes of their deg'rate line*. [shine,

Such were the sentiments of that writer, who, more than all the rest put together, has done honour to English literature. Such was the *language* of the friend and companion of BOLINGBROKE and ATTENBURY; of the man, whose writings were the admiration of his day, and the model for succeeding times; of the man, whose acquaintance and friendship were sought by *all* the statesmen of his time; of a man, whom a queen wished to visit, but whose scrupulous independence declined the intended honour.—Now, can any man shew me in any periodical publication of the present day, language more completely divested of squeamishness than this? Does any political writer of this day presume to go beyond what is here exhibited; and what was practised by this accomplished gentleman? To our clamourers we may say as he did to his: “*Speak out, and bid us blame no rogues at all;*” for that is the point, at which, it is evident, the venal writers are aiming. POPE was freely permitted to “*strike that Wild*,” the famous *pick-pocket*; but the clamourers wished to prevent him from soaring *higher*. Here, too, we see an exact similarity: we, too, may take a free range in attacking the poor shoe-less caitiffs, who are brought before the police magistrates, whom, before they are tried, we call *rogues, villains*, and what else we please, *naming* them at the same time. Here, against these miserable wretches, we have “*free-dom of the press enough*;” but, if we so much as laugh at those, who “*make saints of queens, and gods of kings*,” we are branded as conspiring traitors, as men having formed a settled scheme for overturning the monarchical branch of the constitution. In another poem, and that, too, the most admirable of all his admirable works, he has these verses.

A nymph of quality admires our Knight:  
He marries, bows at court, and grows polite;

Leaves the dull cits, and joins (to please the fair)  
*The well-bred cuckolds of St. James's air*:  
First for his son a gay commission buys,  
Who drinks, whores, fights, and in a duel dies :  
His daughter flaunts a *Viscount's* tawdry wife;  
*She bears a coronet and p—x for life.*

If any of us were to publish, from our pens, a story like this, it would be produced as a *certain proof* of our intention, of our settled design, of our deliberate scheme, for overturning the privileged orders, and with them the whole of the establishments of the kingdom. Yet, in the days of POPE, that man would have been laughed to scorn, who should have attempted to set up such a clamour; though despotism was much less prevalent in that day, throughout the whole of Europe, than in the day in which we live. Here is “*coarseness*” for you! Yet is this poem published now, daily; and is to be sold, and is sold, at every bookseller’s shop in England. Why not suppress these publications? That they have their effect is evident, even from the use I am now making of them. And, a publication is still a publication, whether the book be of ancient or modern date. Why not put down all these publications, with which our printing-offices, and book-shops, and circulating-libraries teem? Why not put them down, and not expose us to the mortification of seeing, and the danger of being led to imitate, the boldness of our celebrated countrymen? Why not put down these works, which are read more in one day, than all the Anti-Jacobin writings that ever were published, or have ever been read, not excepting the *Weekly Anti-Jacobin*, with which the series began, the writers of which, by-the-by, affected to imitate POPE, but whose poetry as well as whose prose, after having assisted to ruin the bookseller, have, long since, been consigned over to the trunk-maker; though not destitute of “*personality*,” or of “*filthy*” allusion? Why not put down the works of POPE, and SWIFT, and GAY, and GARTH, and AKENSIDE, and CHURCHILL, and scores of others; nay, and of poor JOHNSON, too, though a dependent and a pensioner; and of MILTON, and LOCKE, and PALEY. The list is endless. Why not put them all down? Why not burn them all by the hands of the common hangman, and not expose us to the danger of imbibing, and acting upon, their principles, and, according to our abilities, imitating their writings?—Of the *constitution* of England the *liberty of the press* constitutes an essential part. The powers, lodged in the

crown and its ministers, has been there lodged upon the presumption, upon the *implied condition*, that the exercise of it shall be open to public, free, and *unrestrained*, investigation, through the means of the press. It is in this sense, and this sense only, that the phrase, “*liberty* “of the press” has any comprehensible political meaning. To utter *lies* is always a moral offence; to utter them to any one’s injury is, and always has been, an offence punishable by law. If, therefore, the utterer cannot prove the *truth* of what he has uttered, and if it be proved that his lies have produced even a *fair probable* injury, he ought to suffer for the offence. But as to *opinions*; to make men liable to punishment for opinions, is, at once, to say, “*slave!* you shall not utter your thoughts.” If the opinion be accompanied with *reasons*, these are the reasons to be examined; if good, the opinion will, and ought, to have weight with the reader; if bad, or if no reasons at all be given, the opinion is mere wind; it passes for nothing, and can have no effect.

—It is an observation that can have escaped no man, that despotic governments have never tolerated free discussions on political matters. The reason is plain; that their deeds will not bear the display of reason and the light of truth. But, what has been the invariable consequence? The sudden final destruction of those governments. The flame of discontent is smothered, not extinguished; the embers are still alive, the materials drying, the combustibles engendering; some single accidental spark, from within or without, at last communicates the destructive principle, and down comes the pile, crumbling upon the heads of its possessors. Let free discussion take its course, and, as you proceed, abuses and corruptions are done away, redress from time to time, is obtained; or, at the very least, the breast of the injured and indignant is unloaded. The Charleses and the Jameses had recourse, under the colour of law, to imprisoning, ear-cropping, and hanging; and what were the final consequences? James was the instigator to the beheading of Russel, and James, when, in the hour of distress he appealed to Russel’s father for support, received for answer: “I had once a son, “who, if he had been now alive, might “have been able to give you assistance.”

—Had the Charleses and the Jameses, instead of listening to the counsel of parasites calling themselves “*the loyal*,” to the exclusion of others, permitted free discussion; had they allowed corruption to be checked in its course; had they, as it was manifestly their interest, suffered their people to obtain *timely* redress of their wrongs; their descendants would now have been upon the throne of this country, which they would have enjoyed, without any danger from plots and conspiracies. But, they arrayed *power* against *truth*, and in that conflict, they finally fell.—What is the reason, that all these reports about the Duke of York; all this “*talking him down*,” have so long prevailed, and have gone rolling on, till, at last, they have collected into that form, in which they have been exhibited to the parliament? The reason simply is, that the press has been *timid*. If this had not been the case, some one or other of the reports would, long ago, have been embodied into a *plain statement*, when it would; if false, have met with as plain a denial, and there would have ended the calumny; if true, the effect would have been, a stop to the reported practices *in time*; before any great degree of discontent had been engendered, and leaving only a trifling fault to be atoned for. But, punish men for writing plainly, and they will have recourse to metaphor or fable; punish them for that, and they will talk; punish them for that, and they will whisper; and, at every stage of restriction, they will, by their additional bitterness, show that to the feeling of public is added the feeling of personal injury, and also of personal resentment.—I hope, and trust, that these observations, and others of a similar tendency from abler hands, will have their due weight, and that the conspiracy against the remaining freedom of the press, as well as against the persons now under government prosecution, will not be persevered in; but, upon one thing I am resolved, be the consequences to myself what they may, and that is, to continue to exercise the freedom of writing and of speaking, as my forefathers were wont to exercise it, as long as I have my senses, and the power of doing either one or the other. As witness my hand,

WILLIAM COBBETT.  
Botley, 2d February, 1809.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 6.] LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1809. [Price 10d.

In the old Pitt administration, about the year 1800, the sum of *fifty-four thousand pounds* were lent, out of the public money, without any previous consent of Parliament, to the DUKE OF YORK, which was to be repaid by instalments of one thousand pound each quarter of a year, *but not to begin until January 1805*. The Duke was then, as he is now, Commander in Chief, Colonel of Guards, &c. &c. and had pensions, for himself and Duchess, to the amount of *thirty thousand pounds a year*, not including any grant upon the Irish establishment.

The earl of Hardwicke (*brother of Mr. CHARLES YORKE,*) obtained, in September 1805, the reversion of the sinecure place of *Clerk of the Common Pleas in the Irish Exchequer*. This place, which is, in the Parliamentary Reports, stated to be worth *eleven thousand and ninety-four pounds a year*, is now enjoyed by the earl of Buckinghamshire; and, observe, it is, after his death, to be enjoyed by lord Hardwicke during *the lives of his two sons*, lord viscount Royston and Charles James Yorke.

John BERESFORD, jun. and James Beresford, esqrs, have for their joint lives, with benefit of survivorship, *a thousand pounds a year*, as WINE-TASTERS in Ireland, which place they have enjoyed since 18th February, 1802. H. B. Beresford, and John Claudius Beresford, jun. have the lucrative place of STOREKEEPERS OF THE CUSTOM-HOUSE, Dublin, and have had it since May, 1802. The amount of the profits is not stated in the Report.

193]

[194

## DUKE OF YORK.

(Continued from page 192.)

I last week expressed my regret, that any thing should have occurred to prevent me from giving an account of the campaign in Spain. That expression I now repeat; and, there are several other subjects, of great political importance, on which I am anxious to offer some remarks to the public; but, the subject of the Charges against the Duke of York, especially as these charges have been forced into connection with questions of general policy and liberty; this subject is not only of more interest than any other, but, it absolutely supersedes all other; discussion upon any other subject, is, in fact, useless, till this has been decided upon. An attempt has, through a connection with Mr. Wardle's charges, been made to deprive us of the remains of our freedom. From the tone and manner of the venal herd of writers, it has long been manifest, that there was on foot a scheme for putting down all free discussion; and, upon the preferring of these charges, they have broke out afresh, and with more boldness than ever, in accusations, not only against the freedom of the press, but also against the freedom of the tongue. Their mode of reasoning is this: "these charges are *false*; such charges are the consequence of the *licentiousness* of writing and of speaking; such charges tend to overthrow the monarchical branch of the constitution; to overthrow the monarchical branch of the constitution would be to produce general confusion, distress, misery, and blood-shed; therefore-

"fore, it is the interest of the nation in general, and particularly of all persons of property, to concur in putting a stop to this licentiousness of writing and of speaking." Such is the reasoning of the venal writers, in news-papers, magazines, pamphlets, and especially in the poor paltry Reviews, which are conducted by clergymen, by salaried magistrates, and by pensioners. To this sort of reasoning not a little countenance has now been given by persons in possession of great official power. One minister has said, that it is become matter of doubt with many good men, whether the benefit of a free press be not overbalanced by the licentiousness attending it; and another of the king's ministers has said, that it is not perceived by every one, how difficult it is, in many cases, to convict a man of a libel, though the libel be obvious enough. Just at this very time, too, we see advertised, *at an enormous expence*, to be published by the Horse-Guards bookseller, EGERTON, a pamphlet pointing out the present difficulties of producing conviction in cases of libel, which pamphlet is dedicated to the Duke of York and Albany. While this is going on, a Mr. WHARTON, who, I am told, is the same that is Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means in the House of Commons, is publishing a pamphlet to inculcate the notion, that Jacobinism is revived. This is, to be sure, an excessively stupid and dirty performance; it is so very low, so very shabby, so very despicable, that one cannot help laughing at it, especially when one considers it as opposed to the Edinburgh Review; but, it does, nevertheless, tend to prove the existence of a

concert, premeditated or accidental, to persuade the public at large, that there is yet too much freedom of writing and speaking enjoyed.—Till this point, therefore, is settled, all other public matters are uninteresting. From freedom of speech and of the press, the next step is the safety of property and person. The war in Spain, or any where else; the success or failure of any military or naval enterprize; the additional conquests and increasing means of the Emperor Napoleon; all these are of no interest to us, if we be in a state of uncertainty as to what is to be the fate of our freedom at home. We are called upon daily for “sacrifices” in support of the war against the Emperor of France; and, upon what ground are these sacrifices demanded? Why, upon the ground, that the war is necessary to prevent our country from being finally conquered by Napoleon. And, why, wherefore, for what reason, are we called upon to make sacrifices to prevent our country from being conquered by Napoleon? The reason alledged is this: that, if he were to conquer our country, we should become slaves; that is to say, we, like the people in France, should be deprived of the liberty of uttering our complaints, whatever corrupt and profligate acts our rulers might be guilty of; and, that, we, being thus deprived, should, in a short time, have no security for our property or our lives. It is to prevent this evil; this very evil, that we are making many such enormous pecuniary sacrifices, and that so many of our countrymen make a sacrifice of their lives. Viewing the struggle in any other light, there is no sense in it. In any light but this we cannot view the contest, without acknowledging ourselves to be almost upon a level with the brute creation. It is not for a name, for an empty sound, for any thing merely imaginary, that we are making all these unparalleled sacrifices. It is not for any thing theoretical; but for the substantial practical benefit of English freedom; the right, the legal right, of freely making our complaints, and of demanding redress, when we think ourselves injured or insulted; which, as all the world must see, are the only means of insuring safety to property and persons.—Till, therefore, we see the result of the pending proceedings, and the fate of the doctrines, now abroad, relative to the freedom of the people, all other public matters, not excepting those relating to our means of defence against the conquering Napoleon, are, comparatively at least, of very trifling

importance. To busy ourselves about schemes of war or peace, or of political economy; thus to busy ourselves, while the present proceedings are unclosed and while these new doctrines are undecided upon, would be as foolish as for a man to be engaged in making repairs at one end of his house, while the other end was on fire.—This being my view of the matter, I shall, as far as my small power will go, keep the attention of the public closely nailed to the inquiries now going on, relative to the conduct of the Duke of York, who is not to be regarded merely as “a son of the crown,” as Mr. Fuller called him, nor merely as the person, to whose skill and courage the military defence of our country is committed; but also as a person who has the chief command of a department, which costs this nation 23 millions of pounds sterling a year; and who, under the king’s sole controul, has the absolute power of promoting, or of cashiering, any one, or any number, of about twelve, or fifteen, thousand commissioned and staff officers, connected by ties, more or less close, with almost all the families, of any note, in the kingdom. Merely as a son of the king, and a person receiving such large sums out of the public purse, we should have an interest, and a deep interest, too, in the moral example of the Duke of York; what, then, must be our interest in his wisdom and integrity, when we see committed to his hands a far greater degree of power than has, in this country, ever before been committed to the hands of any individual?—In my last, at page 174, I was obliged to break off the insertion of the first Debate upon this all-important subject. The remainder of that debate I shall now first insert, and, when that is done, I shall come to the first Examination of witnesses, of which Examination I shall be careful to omit no essential part, and especially of what has a tendency in favour of the Duke of York; because, on every account, my wish is, that no conclusion against him should be drawn from doubtful premises.

*Debate of the 27th January, continued from page 174.*

—and of this plan the present was only a particular instance, (hear! hear!).—‡

† He was glad that this enquiry was to take place, because there was in the country a conspiracy against all that was eminent in the state. They all knew what that spirit was upon which this conspiracy was

Let blame fall where it ought; but the House ought to consider the illustrious object against whom the charge was directed; they ought to consider his high station in the country, and the *eminent services* which he had performed for the country, in the state to which he had brought the army—  
*(hear! hear!* What was the state of the army when he became Commander in Chief? It scarcely deserved the name of an army, and it was now found by experience to be, in proportion to its numbers, the best army that ever existed. The best mode to do justice to the sovereign—to do justice to the high character now impeached—and to do justice to the country, would, perhaps, be to appoint a Parliamentary Commission, with power to examine each party on oath—*(loud cries of hear! hear! from both sides of the House.)* The gentleman might have circumstances in view to support these charges, which he believed to be founded in truth. He only spoke of this Commission with reference to his own argument. He had said that he believed a CONSPIRACY to exist, and if the House could go along with him, and suppose that this was actually the case, he threw out for their consideration, whether a Parliamentary Commission with power to examine on oath was not preferable to a Committee. He could not think he had done his duty if he had not thrown out this idea for consideration. The importance of the subject well deserved such a mode of proceeding. But at all events, he was *happy* that the matter would now be properly investigated.

Sir FRANCIS BURDETT considered the

founded; and though it was not the same at present as at the time of the French revolution, yet, as the *late Mr. Pitt* had truly said “*the jacobinical spirit, when once roused, is not easily put down.*” The spirit was not yet extinct, and the consequence was a conspiracy for *taking* and *writing* down every thing illustrious and eminent in the nation—to run down the royal family through the duke of York, and to run down the army through its generals. This was a consequence of a free press, the freedom of which was justly considered the *palladium of liberty*, but whose licentiousness was the destruction of civil society. That licentiousness of the press had been actively directed against the illustrious person who was the object of this motion, and who from his station and *all his past services*, might be supposed secure from its attacks.

subject most important, and demanding the deepest and most accurate inquiry. He coincided with the right hon. gent. opposite (Mr. Yorke), that the House should maturely deliberate on the mode of proceeding best calculated to render effectual justice.

Mr. ADAM stated, that for nearly the period of 20 years he had been, from professional avocations, very intimately connected not alone with the pecuniary concerns of the illustrious personage affected by the motion of the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle), but even with his embarrassments. In the attention which he had directed to those concerns, he was assisted by the most frank and candid communications from his royal highness. Every difficulty, and every particular was disclosed to him by his royal highness with a recollection the most retentive, an accuracy the most correct, and a fidelity the most unquestionable. If, therefore, any such irregularities or transactions took place, *it was almost impossible but that in the course of his inquiries some feature of such a system would have appeared*, whereas the direct contrary was the result of a long and minute application to the pecuniary transactions of his royal highness\*. Having felt it his duty to make this statement, he had next to impress upon the House that both in justice to its own privileges, and to the dignified character of the illustrious personage, it ought not to surrender its inquisitorial powers,

\* At every moment of that long period he had possessed the unlimited confidence of that illustrious person, even during his embarrassments (for as they had been under the consideration of Parliament, he may advert to these embarrassments), and in all his experience of him, he had known his royal highness uniformly to state the situation of his affairs with an accuracy that was extraordinary, with a truth beyond example, and with a fidelity of memory that reflected the highest credit upon his understanding. In all that time he had never heard of his having procured any accommodation or loan on any other terms, than the Duke of Bedford, the Duke of Devonshire, or the Duke of Northumberland would, if they had occasion. This he stated, in order to shew that, in the inquiry that was, to take place, from what he knew personally, he could confidently assert that the facts alleged would prove unfounded.

nor delegate to any Select or Secret Committee that inquiry, which, to be efficient, ought to be public, and for the *publicity* of which there was no person in the country *more anxious* than his royal highness the duke of York—(*Hear! hear!*).

Mr. WILBERFORCE expressed his sense of the importance of the subject which was submitted to the consideration of the House. He was confident that the hon. mover was impressed with the great responsibility which attached to a charge brought, as it was, against such an elevated character in the country. He did by no means wish to convey that the extent of such responsibility ought at all to deter a member of that House from bringing before it an accusation, for which he had convincing testimony, although directed against one of the most considerable persons in the empire, both in rank or influence; but he did conceive that when high character was implicated, the most efficient and most satisfactory mode of investigation ought to be adopted. To enable the House to arrive at that desirable end, he fully agreed with his right Hon. friend (Mr. Yorke) near him, that the investigation of the charges that night preferred ought to be committed to a Parliamentary Commission, specially delegated for that specific purpose. Such inquiry was not to be considered private or secret. It would afford the best species of communication, namely, publicity at the end, but not in the progress. Whoever had attended to the consequences of public examination at the Bar of the House, could not be blind to the numerous and fatal inconveniences of such a mode of proceeding. The very object for which it was proposed was too often defeated by the means. By acquiescing to the appointment of a commission the witnesses would be examined upon oath, all party bias and personal altercation would be prevented, and, of course a weight and confidence would be attached to the decision of those delegated, which it was impossible to expect from any public discussion or examination at the Bar. It was for the house to bear strongly in its recollection, that in the present unexampled and critical state of the civilized world, all Europe looked with a vigilant and anxious attention to the deliberations of the British House of Commons. *That House was now put on its trial before the scrutinizing tribunal of public opinion.* It had to render justice, both to the illustrious personage, whose character he expected

would come clear and unsullied from the ordeal, and to the country, who was equally interested in the result. The claims of the public demanded that the representatives of the people should look to substantial justice, however high the rank, eminent the services, or splendid the connections of the dignified personage against whom such charges were preferred.—That justice, he conceived, could be most satisfactorily obtained by an inquiry, private in its progress, but to be public in the result, particularly when he reflected on the description of persons likely to be examined, and the importance of the interests affected by the accusation.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER coincided in the unanimous feelings of the House, that to the most solemn and serious accusation brought forward that night, the most solemn and serious inquiry ought to be afforded. The only difference that seemed to exist in the mind of gentlemen was, as to the manner of conducting that investigation, whether the ends, to which all looked with equal eagerness, were more likely to be acquired by a private and delegated examination, or by a full, prompt, and public discussion, arising from the testimony, which the hon. gent. who submitted those charges to parliamentary considerations may be enabled to produce at the Bar of that House. When he contemplated the important interests which the country had, whether in acquitting the exalted personage, if, as he was convinced, the event would prove, such charges could not be substantiated, or in rendering justice to the dignity of the character of parliament, he was compelled by all and every consideration, to call upon that House not to abandon its legitimate judicial province, and by its first step to deprive itself of that freedom of conduct and action, that might eventually preclude it from adopting the course which it might be convinced was ultimately serviceable. There was no course that could prove satisfactory to the country, but a public one—and whatever inconveniences may follow from its adoption, they were dissipated by the superior and paramount advantages. Independent of its general recommendation some consideration ought to be extended to the wishes of his royal highness. That wish he could positively state was, that the investigation should be most complete and public (*hear! hear! hear!*). There was nothing that his royal highness so particularly deprecated as any secret or close

discussion of those charges. Standing as that illustrious personage did on the fairness of his character, and the fulness of the evidence which he was enabled to produce in refutation of these charges, he was most peculiarly anxious to appear before the country; if acquitted, acquitted by the most accurate and severe inquiry, or if condemned, condemned by the most public and undeniable evidence. Was the present moment suitable for the statements, he believed he could enter into particulars which would convince the House, that it was impossible to bring those alledged charges home to his royal highness. The hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle) had in the course of his speech stated a circumstance which particularly involved the character of his majesty's government. He had mentioned that two members of the king's cabinet were concerned in this agency for the disposal of government patronage. This was a topic on which he felt it due to himself to require the fullest information, and it was for the option of the hon. gent. to determine, whether he would afford it in a public manner in that House, or by a private communication to some of the responsible servants of the crown (*a cry of name! name!*). When in possession of that information, he assured the House that by him no measure would be left undone to unravel and elucidate the truth or falsehood of that allegation. It was not for him to tell that House, that in this great capital it might happen that foolish persons were frequently deceived by advertisements in the public papers, announcing the disposal of official patronage. And perhaps it has occasionally turned out, that the very persons who were originally deceived by these advertisements to make applications, did ultimately obtain the very appointments for which they had endeavoured to negotiate; but he was convinced that as there was nothing so discreditable to government, so there was nothing more false in fact than the idea, that money was paid to persons high in office for such transactions. For the distinct manner in which the hon. gent. submitted the question to the House, he conceived him entitled to its thanks. He had pledged himself to bring his charges home to h. r. h. the Duke of York. Upon that pledge the proposed inquiry was admitted; and both for the accuser and the accused, to guard against suppression and insufficiency of evidence, publicity was essentially necessary.

Mr. WARDLE stated, that he was anxi-

ous to afford the fullest inquiry in his power to the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The office where this agency was transacted was in Threadneedle-street, under the firm of Pollman and Heylock. The persons conducting the business there did not deny the influence under which they were able to procure appointments. They had stated various situations purchased in the island of Jamaica, and that two members of the present Cabinet, for whom they acted in such negociations, and to whom he alluded in his speech, were the lord Chancellor and the duke of Portland.

It was then carried, *nemine contradicente*, That the Conduct of his royal highness the Commander in Chief, in the appointment of Commissions, and filling up of Vacancies in the Army, be referred to a Committee.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER then moved, that it should be a Committee of the whole House.

Lord FOLKSTONE considered the honourable mover entitled to the fullest credit, for the manner in which he brought the subject forward. He was of opinion that the ends of justice would be best answered by referring the inquiry to a Select Committee, from whose Reports all the benefits of publicity would be derived. It was extraordinary to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer interfere with the mode of proceeding which the hon. mover had adopted, when the House recollects with what severe comment that gentleman (Mr. Perceval) remarked upon certain members at his side of the House, for the alledged indecorum of taking certain measures out of the hands of the original proposers.

Mr. SECRETARY CANNING conceived that the surprise expressed by the noble lord in seeing his right honourable friend propose to the consideration of that House the most desirable mode of proceeding, would have been prevented if that noble lord had considered the nature of the improvement which was recommended. The interference of his right hon. friend was not to restrict, but to extend inquiry—it was not to narrow the means, but to enlarge the sphere of deliberation. It was an improvement suited to the importance of the accusation, and to that serious discussion which so many commanding inducements pressed it upon that House to afford. The House should recollect that if such charges were proved, the issue of its deliberation might lead to a proceed-

ing affecting the most valuable privileges of Parliament, and the dearest interests of the elevated and illustrious personage affected by their decision. It was established by various precedents in Parliamentary history. It was to a Committee of the whole House the case of the duke of Marlborough was submitted, because such proceeding was considered correspondent with the gravity of its judicial character, and because it was a species of trial which *united carking with publicity*. When, therefore, the noble lord complained that an attempt was made to take the subject out of the hands of the hon. gent. who originally brought it forward, the propriety of his reproach amounted to this, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had proposed a motion calculated most effectually to promote the object, which the original mover professed to have solely in his view. Indeed the hon. mover himself did not feel any unjustifiable attempt at interference, nor did he evince any hostility to submit his charges to the House of Commons in its most extended capacity. That hon. gent. had declared to the House, that in calling its attention to this very solemn subject, he was solely actuated by the sense of public duty; that he was free from any hostile feeling to the elevated personage, whose character his charges went so vitally to affect. For the impulse of public spirit and disinterested patriotism, he (Mr. Canning) was willing to give him credit, and surely that hon. gent. could not be dissatisfied with those who placed him upon the most commanding stage, to reap the benefit of his patriotic labours.—(*Hear! hear!*.)—

(To be concluded in my next.)

On Wednesday, the 1st instant, Mr. Wardle, after an introductory speech, brought forward the charge, relating to an exchange of MAJOR BROOKE of the 56th foot to the 5th dragoons, the other party being LIEUT. COL. KNIGHT.—The charge was this: that the application of these two gentlemen had been, for some time, before the Duke of York; that the exchange was not ordered to be permitted, 'till Mr. Robert Knight, brother of Lieut. Col. Knight, had, through the negotiation of a Dr. Thynne (the medical attendant of Mrs. Clarke), got the thing effected by paying to Mrs. Clarke the sum of 200*l.*; that the Duke of York, before the exchange was ordered, knew that Mrs. Clarke was to receive some money in consequence of it;

and that, after the exchange was ordered and the money received by Mrs. Clarke, he, the Duke, was informed by her of such receipt.

The first witness, in support of this Charge, was Dr. Andrew Thynne, who stated, that, at the request of Mr. Knight, he made the overture to Mrs. Clarke; that he was authorized to offer her 200*l.* if she would cause the exchange to be expedited; that he expected her to be able to get the thing done through her influence with a certain great person; that this great person was the Commander in Chief; that, when the exchange was effected, Mrs. Clarke sent to the witness the Gazette, in which it was recorded, accompanied with a note from herself, saying, that, as she was going to the country, 200*l.* would be very convenient to her; that, when he made the offer to Mrs. Clarke, he gave her the names of the parties upon a slip of paper; that Mrs. Clarke talked about the necessity of secrecy, but the witness cannot tell from whom she was desirous to keep the thing a secret; that he never saw the Duke of York at Mrs. Clarke's; that he, the witness, understood, from Mr. Knight, that the exchange would be carried through in the regular manner, but Mr. Knight wished, in consequence of the bad health of his brother, that the business should be expedited, and for that purpose application was made to Mrs. Clarke.

Mr. Robert Knight corroborated Dr. Thynne as to the motive of the application to Mrs. Clarke; he said further, that, when the exchange was effected, he sent Mrs. Clarke the 200*l.*; that his brother had before received, from the office of the Duke of York, a notification in the usual way, that, when a proper successor presented, there would be no objection to the exchange; that he does not know of any positive promise made to his brother by the Duke, previous to the application to Mrs. Clarke. Upon being asked: "Why was the application made to Mrs. Clarke?" he answered, "There was a delay in the business; but the cause of it I do not know. I mentioned the circumstance to Mr. Thynne, who was then attending my family. He advised me to apply to a good friend of his, Mrs. Clarke." He then repeated what he has said before about the offer of money.—Upon further questioning, he says, that Mrs. Clarke desired him to keep the whole transaction a secret, *lest it should come to the ears of the Duke of York*; and

that, recently, she has told him, that the Duke having used her extremely ill, leaving her in debt about 2,000*l.* she would, if she could bring him to no terms, expose him, whereupon the witness said, he hoped she would not expose him and his brother by mentioning their names, to which she answered, that God knew that was not her intention.

*Mrs. Clarke* was next examined by Mr. WARDLE, and her examination, all through, I shall give just as I find it in the Morning Chronicle news-paper, where I find it given in the best manner. The whole of the Evidence, as reported to the House, will hereafter be published in the PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES; but, if, upon seeing it in that shape, which I soon shall, I should discover any material error in the news-paper report, I shall lose no time in publishing a correction of it. The evidence of this witness should *all* be before the public; we should have a fair view of every part of it; because she must necessarily be the principal witness *as to the knowledge which the Duke had of these transactions with her*; and because, of course, much, in our decision, must depend upon the *credibility* of her testimony, and that credibility must again depend upon the *general complexion and character* of that testimony.

#### EXAMINATION OF *Mrs. Clarke*.

DID the witness in the month of July 1805, reside in Gloucester-place? I did.—Under whose protection was she at that time living? Under that of his royal highness the duke of York.—Did Dr. Thynne at that time attend the witness in his professional capacity? He did, and was for some years in the habit of doing so.—Was there any application made by Dr. Thynne to the witness, relative to an exchange between lieut.-col. Knight and lieut.-col. Brooke? There was, and doctor Thynne urged strongly the necessity of great dispatch.—Was there any pecuniary compliment held out as an inducement to the witness to use her interest to promote the exchange? He promised on the part of Mr. Knight, that a compliment should be made me.—Was not the witness promised a consideration in money when the change would be effected; was she not promised a sum of 200*l.*? I was.—After Dr. Thynne's application to the witness, did she speak to the Commander in Chief upon the subject of that application? I told him of it that day at dinner, and handed over to him the slip of paper Dr. Thynne had given to me, containing the names of the parties. I told him I did not know them, but had reason to believe they would make me a compliment. I did not then state to his royal highness the amount of the sum; but when the exchange was ef-

fected, and that appeared in the Gazette, I sent the Gazette with a note to Dr. Thynne.—Did the witness, after she had sent the Gazette to Dr. Thynne, receive any pecuniary consideration, from any person, on account of the exchange having been effected? I received afterwards 200*l.* in two Bank notes, under cover, with Dr. Thynne's compliments.—Were the compliments sent verbally by the messenger, or written in the cover? I rather think written, but am not certain.—Did the witness make known to the Commander in Chief the having received this money upon this account? I mentioned it to his royal highness on that day.—Is the witness sure his royal highness must have been apprized of the amount of the notes? He must have been; because I shewed him the note, and sent one of the servants to get it changed for me.—(Sir T. Turton.) Does the witness know Mr. Robert Knight? Yes; I met him in company with Mr. Biddulph.—Can the witness state, as near as possible, what conversation passed at this meeting? I cannot recollect. I had certainly a conversation with Mr. R. Knight relative to his brother's exchange. That affair gave rise to our intimacy.—Did the witness ever desire Mr. Robert Knight to keep the transaction about which they were then conferring, a secret? I don't recollect that I did; but it is likely that in such a case I might have given such a caution; perhaps I did; but I don't recollect it.—Did the witness charge Mr. R. Knight to keep that transaction a secret from the Commander in Chief? Oh! no, no, never; certainly not; I'm quite sure of that.—(Mr. Lyttleton.) At the time the witness communicated to the duke of York, the application made to her by Dr. Thynne on the part of lieut.-col. Knight to expedite his exchange, did his royal highness make any remark, and what? His royal highness said, he knew the business very well; that there had been much application about it; but that he suspected that *one of them* was rather a *bad subject*. However, he would do it; it should be done.—When the witness shewed to the Commander in Chief the bank note she had received for her using her interest in this business, did his royal highness make any observation, and what? I don't recollect that he made any.—(The Attorney-General.) What time was the application of Dr. Thynne made to the witness? I can't say.—Was it more than three days before the exchange appeared in the Gazette? I don't think it was more.—When did the witness first mention this business to col. Wardle? I don't know; it must have been very lately.—Why does the witness say that it must have been very lately? Because I speak from the fact.—Let the witness mention what fact? It was within the last month.—What, within the last month, did the witness communicate to Mr. Wardle? He asked me was it true? I told him it was; it was he attacked me upon the subject; for he had heard it from other quarters, and had asked me only if it was true.—What led the witness to a knowledge of col. Wardle? Himself.—Was it within the last month that the witness

came to know col. Wardle? I knew him six months before he attacked me on this subject.—Did the witness mention it first to col. Wardle, or in consequence of being first questioned by him? In consequence of his first questioning me: he had heard it from other quarters; upon his asking me was it true, I said it was. I did not then think I should have been brought here in consequence of having said so, or I would have concealed it.—Would the witness have willingly concealed it? I concealed it from the beginning: it was not my wish to make it public. I have sense enough to keep private that which ought to be kept private. When the witness gave col. Wardle an account of this transaction, did she give the same account she has now given? No, I did not.—Which was the true account? Both.—In what do both the true accounts differ? I don't think they differ at all. I mean, I did not then go into the detail I have now; my account to Mr. Wardle was a much shorter one than I have given here.—Can the witness name the day either of the week or month on which Dr. Thynne applied to her? Neither.—The witness has said, that it was not more than 3 days before the Gazette; now the Gazette days were either Tuesdays or Saturdays; was it upon either of those days? I can't be particular in so trifling a matter. I am not conversant in days or dates.—Has the witness told the House all she told col. Wardle in her account to him of this transaction? Much more than I told Mr. Wardle.—What has the witness told the House she did not tell col. Wardle? I did not, as I have said already, go so much into detail as I have done now. I did not tell Mr. Wardle about the shewing the bank-note to his royal highness, nor the getting it changed, and other matters of detail which I have mentioned now.—If col. Wardle had not questioned the witness upon this subject, would she have made any communication to him upon it? Perhaps I might, and perhaps I might not.—Had the witness no end to accomplish in making this transaction known? None whatever.—Did the witness never state any grounds of complaint against the duke of York? All my friends knew that I complained of the conduct of his royal highness.—The witness was not asked as to the knowledge of her friends. Did she herself complain of the duke of York, and threaten in certain circumstances to expose him? I never did. All I did was, I sent a letter to Mr. William Adam (he is present) and I said in that letter that if his royal highness did not pay me the annuity, which he, and Mr. Adam for him, promised should be paid punctually, I would publish his royal highness's letters.—Was this the only letter in which the witness made use of those threats? Not threats; I solicited. I wrote two letters. Mr. Adam has them both.—Did the witness never state that she would expose the duke of York if he did not agree to her terms? Never; the worst I did or said against his royal highness was in those letters, and I wrote them in anger. I did not then expect

to be here, nor is it willing in me that I am here. I know of nothing more in the letters; but satisfy yourself; ask for the letters; read them; they can be produced, I suppose, as Mr. Adam is present. He has them.—Did the witness never state to any person whatever, that if the Duke of York did not satisfy her, she would expose him? Never.—Or to that effect? I never said any thing to that effect.—She was quite sure of that? Positive.—Did not she tell Mr. R. Knight something to a similar effect? No, I told him that I was going to publish the Duke's letters, in order to raise money to pay the creditors, whom his royal highness had refused to pay. *His royal highness had insisted I should plead my marriage to avoid the debts, and if I did not, I must go to prison; there was nothing else for it.* My lawyer sent me this communication.—Who is your lawyer? The gentleman who is now my lawyer was not then.—Who was at that time your lawyer? Mr. Stokes, of Golden-square. He made the communication to me.—And who made it to him? Somebody from Mr. Wm. Adam, who is himself a sort of a lawyer. Did not the witness lately send for Mr. R. Knight to come to her? Since our acquaintance began, I have asked him often to call and see me.—Did not the witness write Mr. R. Knight a note, requesting him to call upon her, and was it not in consequence of that summons that he did call upon her? It was nothing more than a common note, such as I am in the habit of sending to many more gentlemen of my acquaintance.—Is the witness a married woman? You have no reason to doubt it.—Are you a married woman or not? I am married: Mr. William Adam there has my certificate.—When was the witness married, where, and to whom? I was married about 14 or 15 years ago at Pancras, to a Mr. Joseph Clark.—Is your husband now living? I don't know.—Did not the witness swear herself a widow? No, I did not swear it; I'll explain that: I had applied to the duke of York for 1 or 200*l.*; he sent me back for answer, that if I dared to say or write any thing against him, *he would put me in the pillory or the Bastile.* His royal highness was alarmed at my having (as he thought) sworn myself a widow-woman, *as then the debts could not be avoided;* but I had not sworn myself a widow woman; but as I was called upon at the Court Martial I told the Advocate-General (who certainly treated my distressing situation with more delicacy than the gentleman who has been now examining me), that I thought it would be wrong for me, who was so well-known to be living with the duke of York, to call myself a married woman, and I did say to him, after I had left the Court (not while I was in the Court) that I was a widow. I said I was, but I did not swear I was, though it was erroneous entered in the minutes of the Court Martial.—Who brought this message from the duke of York to the witness? One of his royal highness's most particular and intimate friends.—Who is he? One Taylor, a shoemaker in Bond-street, very well known to

Mr. Adam.—How did the witness make her application for this one or two hundred pounds to his royal highness? By my pen.—By whom did she send her letter? By this same ambassador of Morocco.—Whom does the witness mean by the ambassador of Morocco? The shoemaker.—Was it Taylor, the shoemaker, who brought back the answer from his royal highness? Yes. He gave it as the Duke's words. I have mentioned Taylor's own language.—Mrs. Clarke was then asked whether she had not said that she was born at Berkhamstead, to which she answered, that if she had said so, it was in a laughing and jocular way.—Did you not make Mr. Adam believe that you was born there? I don't know whether Mr. Adam believed it, or not.—Did the witness represent her husband as the nephew of Mr. Alderman Clarke? He told me that he was so,—Did the witness believe that he was the nephew of Mr. Alderman Clarke? Yes.—Did you ever see Mr. Alderman Clarke? I never saw any of my husband's relations, except a brother and sister.—Do you now believe that he was the nephew of Mr. Alderman Clarke? I never asked him any thing concerning his connection. He is nothing at all to me, nor I to him. I have not seen him these three years, nor heard of him since he brought the action against the duke.—What is your husband? I don't know.—What is his business? He is in no business; his father was, he was a millwright.—Did you ever live in Tavistock place? Yes—When? I don't recollect the time exactly. I lived there under the protection of my brother.—How many years ago? I do not recollect.—When did you go to Park-lane? I do not recollect.—How long before you went to Park-lane did you live in Tavistock-place? I do not recollect.—Was you in any other place between the two periods? I might have been in another place.—How long did you live in Tavistock-place? I do not recollect.—Where did you live when you first knew the duke of York? I beg to be excused answering that question.—Chairman. The witness must answer the question? I do not recollect.—Why then did you desire to be excused answering the question? Because I did not recollect.—Is that the only reason for the wish to be excused? Yes.—I desire positively to know whether the witness did not live in Tavistock-place before she knew the duke of York? I do not think that is a fair question. I am a married woman with several children, and one daughter grown up.—I wish to know whether the witness lived in Tavistock-place, before she was under the protection of the duke of York? I was then under his protection.—Was she under his protection when she first lived at Tavistock-place? No, under that of my brother.—Has not the witness said, that she was a widow? No, never, except on the occasion of the court-martial which she had mentioned. She then thought it was saving her family, and also the duke of York, as he too was married.—Does she say she never lived in Tavistock-place, till under the protection of the duke of

York? I knew him previous to that, but did not live with him.—Did she not represent herself to the trades-people there as a widow? Never, to any one.—I would ask, whether she has not threatened, that unless the duke would come into her terms, and pay her what money she wanted, she would put his letters into the hands of persons who would pay her? No.—Did she not state, that she either had or would put on paper all the transactions of the last 14 or 15 years, and put the memorial into the hands of persons who would publish it, unless the duke of York would pay her? No, she could not recollect that she ever said so, but she referred to the letter or letters she had written to Mr. Adam.—The witness had said that she had mentioned this business to others besides Mr. Wardle. Who were they? She did not recollect all her acquaintances with whom she might have conversed on the subject, but at any rate it must have been in a slight sort of way, and was of no consequence.—How long was it before she mentioned the business to Mr. Wardle? She did not exactly recollect, but it was since she wrote to Mr. Adam. She did not know Mr. Wardle at that time.—Who was present besides Mr. Wardle when she first mentioned this business? Some ladies, perhaps of her acquaintance, but nobody of any consequence.—To what man besides Mr. Wardle had she mentioned it? There were many acquaintances of her's to whom it might have been mentioned, but she could not recollect any particular persons.—Did the witness know major Hogan? No, never. She had never seen him in her life. Mr. Greenwood had written to her to say that he was sorry to find she was acquainted with a Mr. Finnerty. She had about nine years ago seen a man of that name, at Margate, who was said to be connected with a newspaper, but had never seen him since.—(Examined by Mr. Croker.) Did the witness recollect any particulars of the conversation she had with Mr. R. Knight, lately, on this subject? Yes. He asked on what terms she was with the duke of York? whether she had been paid her annuity? She said, no: that the trades-people were clamorous for their money, and that she would publish the letters to pay them. Upon which he said, that he hoped she would spare his brother.—Whether any other notice had been taken of this business by Mr. Knight, except that she would spare his brother? No; certainly not.—Whether she had made any inquiries of Mr. Knight with regard to the business under discussion? She asked Mr. Knight what sort of a man the other was who had exchanged with his brother; and he said he was an Irishman.—Whether the witness said any thing more to Mr. Wardle on this subject than at the particular time she had before mentioned, and whether she still would abide by that answer? Yes, she did abide by it.—Whether she had any more than one conversation with Mr. Wardle upon this subject? No; and she hoped she would never hear of it any more.—Whether she was in the habit of

seeing Mr. Wardle more frequently than when making inquiries relative to this business? Yes; she had seen him on other occasions.—Could the witness recollect when the conversation on this subject took place? She had answered that question before.—Had any conversation taken place on this subject within these three days? No.—Had any taken place since Friday last? No.—Did the witness see Mr. Wardle on Saturday last? She saw him at the Opera House.—Whether she saw him any where else than at the Opera House, on Saturday last. Whether Mr. Wardle had intimated that he meant to call her as a witness, and when? Soon after she saw the newspaper which gave an account of the business having been brought forward in the house, he called, and she was angry, as he had made very free with the name of a friend of hers, a Mr. Donovan. Mr. Wardle had one morning taken away a parcel of letters of hers without her sanction, and she could never get them back again.—Whether it was not on Saturday that she saw the newspaper which gave the information? She did not recollect.—Whether she did not see Mr. Wardle on Sunday? She was in the habit of seeing him every other day. She could not exactly recollect.—Did she see him yesterday? She did not.—Whether she was certain of that? She believed she might speak positively.—Had she any conversation with him on the subject this day? Yes.—Whether she now still adhered to her former assertion, that she had no conversation with him on this subject since Friday last? This day something had passed between them about appearing to the summons; and about a week ago he had said that the house would commit her if she did not appear, and send her where they had sent some sheriffs before.—(*Examined by Mr. Lyttleton.*) The witness had stated that she had shewn the note to the Commander in Chief; he wished to know whether she had shewn it at any time except when she mentioned the business of exchange? No.—By whom had the message about Finnerty been sent? By Taylor. He told her that Mr. Greenwood had been reading Mr. Hogan's pamphlet and others; and that he had been informed that she was intimate with Mr. Finnerty, which she then denied, as she did now.—(*Examined by Sir A. Pigot.*) The witness had stated, that Mr. Knight and Mr. Biddulph had paid her a visit together. Did Mr. R. Knight soon after call upon her alone? Many times.—Did she at any time say to him that she was desirous the business should be concealed from the Duke of York? Never in her life.—If any one had said so, then, it was false? Certainly; and she hoped before she left that place that whoever had said so should be called in.—(*Examined by Lord Folkestone.*) The witness had said that she sent the Gazette with a note to Dr. Thynne. He wished to know whether she recollect what was in that note; what were the contents? She did not recollect exactly; but she believed it contained very little.—She had said that the 200*l.* had been sent her in a

note with Dr. Thynne's compliments. Was she quite certain of that? Yes, she was; as she recollects at the time having sent her maid to give the man a guinea.—Were the compliments written in the note, or verbally sent? She was certain that the 200*l.* came inclosed, but as to the compliments, she could not exactly recollect. She had paid very little attention to the matter, as she never expected to be called upon to give an account of the matter.—Did she recollect who brought the note to her house? No; but she understood it to be Dr. Thynne's servant.—Did she recollect the time of the day? It was about the middle of the day.—The witness had said that the exchange took place two days after the application; he wished to know whether she alluded to the application of Dr. Thynne to her, or her application to the duke of York? She spoke to the duke of York about it the same day at dinner.—How soon after that did the exchange appear in the Gazette? Only a few days after.—Whether she had any reason to desire Mr. Knight to conceal his visits from the duke of York, and did she desire him to conceal them? She never received his visits in a way that she wished to be concealed.—(*Examined by Mr. Perceval.*) The witness has said that Mr. Wardle had got her letters without her sanction or consent. He wished to know when that happened? She could not tell precisely; but he laughed the matter off, saying, that he would get possession of all her love letters.—Was it before this inquiry was set on foot? Yes.—How long before? She could not recollect.—Had she any conversation on the subject of the letters with Mr. Wardle before he took them? No.—How happened they to be lying in the way? Because she was leaving her house, and removing to her mother's.—Did the witness mean seriously to say that Mr. Wardle took her letters without her authority. Yes: as he had got many other nonsensical little notes which induced him to take these.—Were these the letters of his royal highness the duke of York to the witness. There might be one or two of the letters of his royal highness intermixed with them.—Did the witness mean to say, that these were for the most part, letters of his royal highness? No.—Why then was it said, that these were the letters that led to this inquiry? Because Mr. Wardle had read them.—Did she recollect ever having been offered any money for delivering up the letters of his royal highness. Never.—Did she put them into the hands of any person, in order to forward any negociation of her own. No; except to Mr. Adam, who was the confidential friend of his royal highness.—Had the witness never said, that she put the letters into the hands of any one, to facilitate a negociation of her own? No; except to Mr. Adam. She had never written a note on the subject of the letters to any but Mr. Adam.—(*By Lord Stanley.*) Whether the duke of York was in the room when the 200*l.* was brought her? No he was not.—How

soon after was it that she stated that Mr. Knight had fulfilled his promise? The same day.—Was it on the same day that she desired the note to be changed? Yes.—What was the name of the servant by whom the note had been changed?—She did not know; it was a very irregular thing to ask servants their names.

Now, before we proceed any further, let us take a view of the Evidence as it stands. FIRST, it is proved, that Dr. Thynne, who had, for several years, attended in the house of Mrs. Clarke, pointed out to Mr. Knight an application to her as the effectual and speedy way of obtaining the Duke of York's approbation of an exchange between two field officers of the army, which exchange had already been applied for in the regular way, and had, as yet, at least, not been obtained: SECOND, it is proved, that Dr. Thynne did make the application to Mrs. Clarke, and that he promised her £.200, in case the exchange should take place: THIRD, it is proved, that the exchange did, in a few days afterwards, take place: FOURTH, it is proved, that Mrs. Clarke, in consequence of the exchange having taken place did receive, from Mr. Knight, the said sum of £.200. All this is proved without any of the testimony of Mrs. Clarke. Mrs. Clarke, if the Duke had a knowledge of the bargain, must be looked upon as an accomplice; and, accomplices are not usually allowed to be sufficient witnesses to produce legal conviction; but, when their evidence is corroborated by strong circumstances, and especially, when, as in this case, they are in no danger themselves, such evidence is invariably taken to be good. She states, that she immediately applied to the Duke; that he said one of the parties was a *bad subject*, but that the thing should be done; and she further states, that when she had received the £.200, she told the Duke of it, and, in his presence, sent the note to be changed by one of his own servants, whose name she does not recollect. If we believe her here, the case is complete. But, as weighing against her evidence, the statement of Mr. Knight has been much dwelt upon. He, who, after the exchange, got acquainted with her, says, that she desired him to keep the matter *a secret*, and that she expressly gave as a reason for this, her fear of the consequences, if it should reach the Duke of York's ears. This statement Mrs. Clarke positively denies. Which are we to believe? Mrs. Clarke, who took the bribe, or Mr. Knight, who gave the bribe, and who first tendered the

bribe? Character, here, is quite out of the question. People may say what they will about Mr. Knight's having been a member of the honourable House. So have many others that I could name. We here see Mr. Robert Knight as a *briber*; and, the parties being, in this respect, upon a level, we must decide between their opposite assertions upon the *internal probabilities* of the case.—Mr. Knight was asked, what part of the transaction Mrs. Clarke wished to have kept a secret; and, whether it was solely the *money* part of it; he answered, that the *whole transaction might be concealed from the Duke*. This question was put so often, and the reports in all the news-papers so exactly correspond with respect to the answer, that there is very little probability of its being incorrect.—Now, then, let it be remarked, that Mr. Knight went to thank Mrs. Clarke for the use of her influence in the case of his brother's exchange, having before paid her £.200 for that influence; and, was it probable, that Mrs. Clarke should express to Mr. Knight a wish, calculated to make him believe, that she had not at all interfered in the matter with the Duke of York? Nay, Mr. Knight himself says, that he looked upon the thing as having been done by her influence, and further, that she took credit to herself for it; but, how could she, if she pretended that she had induced the Duke to do it; how could she, at that same time, have the folly to express a wish, that her having had any hand in the business might be kept from the knowledge of the Duke; kept from the knowledge of that very person, who, if her claim to Mr. Knight's £.200 was not fraudulent as well as corrupt, must have known, that she was the cause of the exchange? Will any one believe, that Mrs. Clarke would say, “It was I who prevailed upon the Duke to ‘permit of your brother's exchange; but, for God's sake, don't let the Duke know of it.’” Why, there is a manifest absurdity in the supposition. It is a thing too preposterous to be believed. That she might, indeed, desire Knight not to *blab*; not to talk of the transaction for it to reach the Duke's ears through *third parties*; this is likely enough, and this she herself admits may have been the case; but, to suppose, that she expressed a fear of the Duke's *knowing* of her having been the instrument in the business: to suppose, that she expressed such a fear to the very man, with whom she was taking credit to herself for having obtained the grant from the Duke, is an absurdity too gross to be for one moment enter-

tained by any man in his senses.—It appears, however, that Mrs. Clarke did tell Mr. Knight, that she would expose the Duke, unless she could bring him to terms; and, it is fair to presume, that she did so, because, not only does she admit something of this sort herself, but it appears, that, in two letters to MR. ADAM, she pushed the threat much further, or, at least, expressed herself more fully. To an enraged woman, fallen from her high estate, and left to be worried by creditors, who had crawled to her in the days of her affluence, a pretty large portion of vindictiveness is fairly imputable: and, this state of her mind the impartial reader of her evidence will not fail to keep constantly in view. Unsupported by strong corroborating circumstances I have no hesitation in saying, that her evidence against the Duke of York would not be worth much; and if the fact of the *offer* of £200, the subsequent *taking place* of the exchange, and the *actual payment* of the £200, immediately afterwards: if all these facts had not been proved, I should have paid very little attention to her testimony, relating to this transaction.—Still however, the Duke's actually *knowing* of her pocketting money on account of the exchange rests solely upon her evidence; and, we must now hear what was said by MR. ADAM, COL. GORDON, and the DUKE'S SERVANT, which, apparently, has been regarded as throwing discredit, not only upon this part of her statement, but upon her general veracity.—We will take the whole of Mr. Adam's statement of the 1st of February as given in the Morning Chronicle of the 2nd.

Mr. Adam said:—A great part of the evidence which I have now to state, I communicated upon a former night to the house. About the year 1789 I was requested by his royal highness the duke of York to look into some of his concerns, and from that period to the present I have continued to examine those concerns with all the attention and accuracy in my power, without acting, as I before mentioned, professionally—without receiving any emolument, but giving my services quite gratuitously. In the year 1805 it came to my knowledge, that the husband of the person who has just gone from your bar, *had threatened to bring an action for crim. con. against the duke of York*, and, in consequence of this information, it became necessary to inquire into the general conduct of that lady, which was found to be very incorrect. But in my intercourse with his royal highness, I observed, that he was exceedingly unwilling to believe the reports made to him, and he continued so indeed to the last. These reports, however, were of

such a nature as to suggest the propriety of a further investigation, and the result was a confirmation of Mrs. Clarke's incorrectness, which was such as tended much to prejudice the interests of the duke of York, not upon military business, for nothing at all appeared of the description of that now before the Committee; but, with regard to money obtained by an improper use of the duke of York's name; this, I felt it my duty to state fully to his royal highness. For the purpose of having the investigation made, I applied to Mr. Lowton, of the Temple, and he employed Mr. Wilkinson to conduct it, who is generally engaged by that eminent solicitor to make preliminary arrangements upon business committed to his direction. The investigation was completed about the 8th of May, 1805, and I had the details of it laid before the duke of York; the consequence was, that his royal highness came to the resolution of putting an end to his connection with Mrs. Clarke, and he requested me to communicate his resolution to her. The separation was a measure which I so much approved—which I felt to be so material to the interest and credit of the duke, that I was induced to overlook any consideration of unpleasantness, and to accede to his royal highness's request. I saw such a disclosure of her character in the report, that I thought it totally inconsistent with his royal highness's honour any longer to continue the connection.—It appeared, indeed, in this Report, that she pleaded her coverture, in defence to an action for goods which she had obtained by representing herself as a widow. Upon my interview with her, I discovered still further proofs of her incorrectness. Although it turned out that she was married at Pancras, she said that she had been married at Berkhamstead. At Berkhamstead also she stated that she had been born, that her mother's name was Mackenzie, and her father's name Parker. But although I had the register of Berkhamstead examined, for forty years back, no such name was to be found. I took occasion to put many questions to Mrs. Clarke in the course of this interview, and I came away from her with the impression that the facts mentioned in the Report I have alluded to were correct. She had stated that her husband was nephew to Mr. Alderman Clarke, the Chamberlain of London, which statement proved to be unfounded. In announcing to Mrs. Clarke the duke of York's resolution to separate from her altogether, I informed her, by his royal highness's authority, that if her conduct should be correct, she would be allowed 400*l.* a year: but for this there was no bond or written obligation whatever. It was merely an annuity, which his royal highness should be at liberty to withdraw, if the conduct of this lady should not be correct. From the time of that communication I have not seen Mrs. Clarke until she appeared at the bar this night. I have stated, I think, all that relates to the transactions in which my name has been used. Upon recollection there are some other points—I received a letter in June 1808 from Mrs. Clarke, which is, no doubt, that to

which she has alluded this night. That letter, I believe, still is in the custody of the gentleman who conducted the examination. Indeed, I endorsed the date and transmitted it to Mr. Wilkinson immediately after I received it. The knowledge I have of Mr. Wilkinson I have stated to the Committee; of the other person, Taylor, mentioned by Mrs. Clarke as an acquaintance of the duke of York's, I have no knowledge whatever. I hope I have explained myself satisfactorily to the Committee. If I have not spoken quite intelligibly, I shall be ready to give any further explanation in my power by answering any question that may be put to me. I think it proper to add that the threat of an action for *crim. con.* was made in 1805, that the inquiry immediately followed, and that the separation took place in 1806.—He did not know whether the annuity promised Mrs. Clarke had been paid her or not, as pensions or matters of that sort formed no part of the financial concerns of the duke of York which were under his administration. Those concerns to which he had to attend related to certain claims, for the discharge of which his royal highness had appropriated a proportion of his annual revenue, to manage which Mr. Coutts and he were appointed trustees. This proportion was originally but 12,000*l.* but it was now raised to between 26 and 30,000*l.* a year, out of which £.4000 were annually applied to the liquidation of debt due by his royal highness to the public, on account of the loan advanced to him under Mr. Pitt's administration. To discharge this and other claims, his royal highness had, highly to his honour, set apart as much of his income as, consistently with necessary expenditure, could be possibly spared.

*Colonel Gordon*, who is the public military Secretary of the Duke of York, says, in substance, this: that it is his duty to make to the Duke a report upon all applications for promotions, or exchanges; that he has no doubt that he made an enquiry upon the case of Knight and Brooke; that he fully believes, that the grant of the exchange was made in consequence of his report; that he kept no minute of the enquiry or report, and was not in the habit of doing so; that the delay in question took place on account of some doubts of the eligibility of Col. Brooke, and not on account of any objection to Col. Knight's request; that he has not the smallest reason to suspect that any influence other than that of the general rules of the service produced the grant of leave to exchange; that the Duke's approbation was given on the 23rd of July, 1805, that the King's signature was affixed to it on the 24th, and that the exchange was gazetted on the 30th.

*Ludovick Armor*, a footman of the Duke of York, said that he was a foreigner;

that he had lived 18 years with the Duke; that no other of the Duke's servants ever went to Mrs. Clarke's; that he used to go there at eight o'clock in the morning to take the Duke's clothes; that he never saw Mrs. Clarke at her house but once, when he went to take a favourite dog for her to see; that the Duke was not then there; that he is quite certain that he never was sent by any one, from her house, to get any note changed. In his cross-examination, he repeated these assertions; he said, that no other servant of the Duke was permitted to go to Mrs. Clarke's; he asserted of his own knowledge, that no other of the Duke's servants ever went there. He said he had been asked (previous to his coming to the House of Commons) the same question about the note, by the Duke, by Mr. Adam, by Mr. Lowten, and by Mr. Wilkinson, and that he had given them the same answer.

I leave the Evidence of Mr. Adam and Col. Gordon, as I find it. The character which Mr. Adam gives of the lady is very bad indeed; but, one cannot help regretting that he should have been the instrument of offering to such a person an annuity of £.400 a year, on the part of the Duke, while the latter was accommodated with so large a loan out of the public money.—If what *Ludovick Armor* says be true; namely, that no other servant of the Duke ever went to Mrs. Clarke's, and that he never took a note to change from that house, what Mrs. Clarke says about sending the note to change must be false. That is quite clear. But, bare justice to the fair annuitant compels us to observe, that this falsehood, if we set it down for one, must have been a mere freak of fancy; for, it would, I think, be impossible to assign, or conceive, any reason for her stating it. Of itself there was nothing in it, either good or bad. To have said, that she merely *shewed* the Duke the money would have answered full as well for all the purposes of accusation and of crimination. It is quite impossible to guess at any end she could have in view by telling such a falsehood, except that of bringing forth Ludovick Armor; or of affording a chance of being exposed as a false witness. If, therefore, she be a false witness, a fabricator of false accusations, we must, I think, allow her to be as awkward an one as ever appeared at any bar in the world.

After the examination of Ludovick Armor, Mr. Wardle examined Mr. Adam, which examination led to a very novel

scene, namely, the reading of *an anonymous letter* in the House.—Mr. Wardle asked Mr. Adam whether he had a *son*, and was answered in the affirmative, adding, that he was Lieut.-Colonel of the 21st regt. of foot. Being asked at what age he was made a Lieut.-Colonel,

Mr. Adam said, that he would answer that question; but the House, he hoped, would allow him to make some previous observations. General sir Charles Stuart, the friend of his early life, asked him, whether any of his five sons had an inclination for the army. There was one of them 14 or 15 years of age, who he thought had a strong tendency that way. The general said, that by the rules of the service he was permitted to appoint him to an ensigncy. He was accordingly made ensign. His regiment was in Canada, and as he was so young he did not join immediately, but was first sent to Woolwich for education. As this question had been asked him, he hoped it would not be considered as unbecoming in him to say of so near a relation, that he distinguished himself extremely. A second commission was given him by gen. Stuart, in a manner equally gratuitous. When the great Abercrombie, likewise the friend of my early life, was sent to the Helder, he went under him at the age of sixteen, as a volunteer. The House would pardon him, as it was impossible for him not to feel strongly, he must state his merits. He landed in a hot fire, and conducted himself so as to command the applause and thanks of all who surrounded him. He was present in every active engagement during that expedition. He commanded a body of men of the number generally committed to a lieutenant. They were from the Supplemental Militia, and required a great deal of management, and it was universally allowed that he conducted them well. When he returned, he was, without any solicitation of his (Mr. Adam), so help him God, appointed to the Coldstream Guards. There he remained till he went to Egypt again under Abercrombie, accompanied by his friend, who had made the same progress as himself, (the son of sir John Warren) who was killed by his side. He landed at the head of the guards, at the famous landing in Egypt, and distinguished himself equally well on that occasion. On his return the duke again appointed him to the rank of major, and at the age of twenty-one he rose to the situation of lieutenant-colonel of the second battalion of the 21st, and afterwards of the first battalion, he (Mr. Adam) having merely stated a circumstance in his favour, which he left entirely to the Duke's consideration; and this regiment was as well commanded as any in the service: he might call upon the officers who were acquainted with the service to confirm his words; and sir John Moore, if he had been alive, would have spoken of him.—Mr. Adam said, that he now would read a letter which he had received, and which appeared to have some reference to this question.

He then read a Letter, which he had received, and of which the following is the report, as given in the Courier news-paper of the 4th of February :

"Sir, your character was once respected; that is now over. Your shifting in the House of Commons, and your interference in the duke of York's lechery concerns, would have dubbed any other man a pimp. This subserviency to royalty has made your son a Colonel at twenty years, and given your other boy a ship."—(I wish, exclaimed the hon. gentleman, turning to Mr. Wardle, you would ask me a question respecting this son too, that I might have an opportunity of telling by what means he got his ship).—“Bravo! Go on! Try if you can say you act for no profit when you get your sons thus provided for. Decide as you please, that the man who is paid for his services out of the public purse, because he is the second man in the kingdom, as you say, and a prince, forsooth, should not shew a good example. Let the Commons decide as they will, the public will judge for themselves; and it is not a decision of the Bear Garden that will convince bidden millions that black is white. This ruinous brick" (it was written in red ink) "is typical of my feelings. I blush for you, and wish you would change your principles to correspond with the colour of your hair, and live the latter part of your time in honour. Though the decision of the House will not go far with the public, yet all eyes are upon it, and the damnation or salvation of the Commons depends upon this decision."

There will be much for observation upon these matters hereafter; but, I cannot refrain from observing, that this audacious letter appeared to kindle somewhat of wrath in the breasts of the honourable House. Mr. ELLISON said it was unworthy of the character of an individual to pay attention to anonymous letters. Mr. ADAM said, that the letter was written to deter him from doing his duty, and to libel the House of Commons, both of which were beyond the power of any such attempt; that he had to protect his own and his family's honour, and that he would do it without minding the opinion of any one.

—Mr. FULLER defended the reading of the letter, and said the House ought to be whipped, if they did not offer £500 or £1000 for discovering the author. “If you are such poor creatures,” said he; but was stopped by a loud and general cry of, order.—The public are much obliged to Mr. Adam for reading this letter, and to Mr. Wardle for taking care to have it inserted in the Evidence. Yet, strange to say, the Morning Chronicle has suppressed it. That print states, that there was a very abusive and vulgar letter

read; but, it does not insert it. This is not dealing fairly either with Mr. Adam, the honourable House, or the Public.

Now, in the account which I have given of the Evidence, as well as of the debates, or that I shall give of either, I am, of course, to be understood merely as re-stating what has been before stated in the news-papers, which original statements may, for ought I know, be incorrect; but, as I said before, if I find them to have been so, I will lose no time in correcting them, and communicating the correction to the public. — Publicity, and even speedy publicity, is what Mr. Canning stated to be desirable, and for that reason he preferred an examination at the bar of the House, in preference to an examination before a committee, upon *oath*. To assist, as far as my little sheet is capable, in this work of publicity, is my object, and shall be my constant endeavour, until the whole of the business is closed. My wish is, that the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, should be known to, and believed by, every soul in the kingdom; and, if this be the case, great *good* must arise from this inquiry, while it is impossible that any *harm* can arise from it. — If there be any one, who, from report, has imbibed prejudices against the Duke of York, this is the time for him to dismiss those prejudices from his mind. He should resolve upon doing that; and by no means give way to the very prevalent and dangerous propensity of hailing open accusation as proof of guilt, merely because such accusations correspond with his pre-conceived opinions. Nothing is more common than to hear men exclaim, when an open accusation takes place, “Ah! I always said so, or I always thought so.” In this state of their minds, the accused stands but a poor chance. They *wish* him to be guilty; and it is but too true, that, what we *wish*, we frequently believe, with or without sufficient reason. Against the whisperings of this spirit of injustice I wish to guard the reader. I hope that all prejudices will be dismissed from the mind of the public; that we shall all look upon the Duke of York as being now accused for the *first* time; that we shall consider him as a person exposed to much ill-will and obloquy from the nature of his situation; and that we shall not condemn him without such proof as would be sufficient to produce the condemnation of any one of ourselves. — But, on the other hand, justice to ourselves, justice to our country and to the army, requires that we should not be carried away

from rational and fair conclusions by any assertions, or insinuations, against the authors of the accusation or against any of the witnesses; by any out-cry about a *Jacobin Conspiracy*, and the *licentiousness of the press*, and a design *against the House of Brunswick*. These, I trust, we shall regard as empty sounds. The utmost extent, to which the press has gone, upon this subject, is, to have published, *that Major Hogan told the Duke of York, that promotions were to be purchased of women at reduced prices; that the Major offered to prove this to the Duke, and that the Duke made no answer, and never called for the proof*. This is the utmost extent of the “*licentiousness of the press*.” The statement may be false; Major Hogan did, perhaps, never say this to the Duke; but, observe, the major does not accuse the Duke of *receiving, either directly or indirectly, any part of the money*; nor does he accuse him of *knowing that any other person got money in such a way*. Well, then, how has the press sinned? What has it done, in this case, to be so severely censured? What has it done to excite “*a doubt whether the benefits of its freedom be not overbalanced by its licentiousness?*” It has now been proved before the parliament itself, that, at the recommendation of the physician of Mrs. Clarke, money was offered to her to obtain from the Duke of York the grant of an exchange in the army; it has been proved, that the exchange soon afterwards took place; and it has been proved, that the money was paid to her according to the terms of the bargain. Must not the parties to this transaction have believed that Mrs. Clarke was the cause of the exchange? Must not *they have believed this?* Were they not liable to talk of it? If such like transactions were frequent, must not the knowledge of them have spread? And, if any public writer came to the knowledge of them, was it not his bounden duty to state them to the public? If not for such purposes, I should be glad to know *for what purpose* there is, or ever was, any thing, called “*the freedom of the press*.” — Mr. Sheridan told the House, that he had besought Mr. Wardle not to proceed with this business, a fact of which I have not the smallest doubt; but he added, that his “honourable friend” (for so he called him) had lent himself to the designs of “*a foul conspiracy*.” Foul conspiracy as long as he pleases; but that will not remove the effect of the evidence of Dr. Thynne, Mr. Knight, and Mr. Adam; the word *conspiracy* will have no weight against the proofs

of the £. 200 bargain with, and of the *annuity* to, Mrs. Clarke; nor will it have any weight at all against the evidence of Mrs. Clarke herself. Conspiracy, indeed! Who should conspire? Where is the conspiracy? Much has been said about the cowardice of general insinuations against the Duke, and about the advantage of, at last, getting at the accusations in a *tangible shape*. Why do we hear nothing specific about this conspiracy? A conspiracy generally implies conspirators. Where are they? At present, all the persons that have appeared are Dr. Thynne, Mr. Robert Knight, and Mrs. Clarke. Are these some of the conspirators? Is Mr. Adam one, who has told us all about the *connection* and the *annuity*? Who the devil are these conspirators then? Where is the place of their meeting? Why not place this conspiracy before us in a "*tangible shape*?" These loose assertions about a conspiracy must operate to the injury of the Duke of York; for the people of this country are too much in the habit of deciding upon the merits of the case; of deciding upon actual evidence, not to suspect to be bad that cause, which has recourse to *recrimination*. It is so constantly the case to hear the guilty revile his accusers, that if the Duke had a *real friend*, that friend would not fail to avoid all such revilings, not fully justified by the *proved turpitude or malice* of the party reviled.—“Jacobinism”! Is it, then, to be a jacobin to complain, that bargains such as that between Mrs. Clarke and Mr. Knight were going on? Is it to be a jacobin to complain, that while the Duke of York was borrowing public money from the minister, he was, as his counsellor has informed us, settling an annuity of £. 400 a year upon a person such as her whom this counsellor has described to us, and who has now, in the parliament, been called “*an infamous woman*”? Is this Jacobinism? Is this to conspire against the illustrious House of Brunswick? Oh! no. It is not the House of Brunswick, but the House in Gloucester Place, and other such scenes of corruption and profligacy, if any exist, that the conspiracy is formed against; and, say the revilers of the press what they will, this is a conspiracy of which all the virtuous part of the nation approves, and in which it most cordially partakes. Is the man, who sees thus squandered part, at least, of the means which his incessant in-

dstry has collected, and which his paternal affection would fain devote to the comfort of his one-day fatherless family; is such a man, because he feels sore, because he expresses his indignation at seeing his earnings squandered in this way; is such a man for such a cause to be reviled as a jacobin and a conspirator, and to be held forth as worthy of the gibbet? If this be the case, away with all the talk about the sacrifices necessary for our defence against a conqueror; for if the devil himself were to become our master, he could not make our situation worse. But, I hope and trust, this is not to be the case; I trust we shall still have a country to fight for, and courage to defend it; that we shall still be *truly free* and *truly loyal* in spite of all the endeavours of all our enemies foreign and domestic; in spite of all their efforts to enslave us, or to goad us into disloyalty.—To Mr. WARDLE, for his public spirit, his frankness, his candid and bold manner of bringing the matter forward, his steady perseverance, and all the admirable qualities he has displayed, upon this occasion, the unanimous thanks of all the worthy part of the nation are due, and, I will add, are justly rendered. I have not conversed with a single person upon the subject, who has not expressed admiration at this gentleman’s conduct. No, he did not *consult* with you, Mr. Sheridan, nor with any of the *party*; but, this, Sir, is that part of his conduct which we most approve of. He wanted no counsel but that of a sound head and an honest heart; no support from any thing but truth and justice. He wanted no “*parliamentary experience*.” None of what has been called “the *tactic of the House*.” He had a complaint to make, in the name of the people, and he made it, without discovering fear either for himself or for his cause. He has neither obtained, nor asked for, any indulgence. In his arduous and most laborious task, he has received assistance from Sir FRANCIS BURDETT and Lord FOLKESTONE; but, whether by *declarers* or any thing else, he appears never to have been disconcerted; his own resources appear never to have failed him; and, at every stage of the proceeding, he has risen in the esteem of the nation, the trading “*anti-jacobins*” excepted.

Bolley, Wednesday, 8th Feb. 1809.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 7.] LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1809. [Price 10d.

On the 27th of July, 1796, a Pension was granted for life to *Lady Augusta Murray*, (lately called DUCHESS OF SUSSEX,) the amount of which pension is 1,200 pounds a year; and on the 24th October, 1806, another Pension was granted to the same person, under the name of *Lady D'Amilard*, for life, which last Pension is, in amount, 1478 pounds a year; both pensions together making 2,678 pounds a year.

225] [226

## DUKE OF YORK.

(Continued from page 224.)

### TO THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

THE attention of every person in this country is now, with more or less eagerness, directed towards what is going on in the House of Commons. By a sort of involuntary motion, all eyes have been turned that way. There is no man that now seems to think it of any consequence what is done in the way of war, or of negotiation. All of us seem to feel, that, until this affair be settled, it would be absurd to waste our thoughts upon any question connected with our interests, or our honour, as a nation.—So far the state of the public mind is what it ought to be. But, while all are exclaiming against the infamous corruptions, plunderings and robberies; the insulting profligacy, that have now been *proved* to exist; while all mouths are open upon these topics, there has appeared no attempt to draw the attention of the *people* to the effect which these abominations have upon them, in their individual and family capacity.—Be this my task, by way of introduction to such other matters and remarks as it appears to me necessary, at this time, to submit to those, who bear the burdens, which arise from the corruptions that have now been *proved* to exist.—To persons, not accustomed to go beneath the surface of things, it may possibly appear, that it makes little difference to the *people*, whether commissions and offices be sold or not, because, in whatever manner they be disposed of, the expence of them must still be the same. But, it requires but very little reflection to perceive, that this proposition is opposed to the truth; for, in the first place, it is evident, that the person who purchases a post, will seek for reimbursement, either in the positive profits of the post, or in a deduction from the time or the services, which ought to be spent or rendered in that post. In the case of DOWLER, for instance, who paid, it appears,

to Mrs. Clarke, large sums of money for his appointment as a Commissary, is it not clear that he would not fail, during the execution of his office, to keep in view the money which he had paid for that office? And is it not equally clear, that he would miss no opportunity of reimbursement? Indeed, it is impossible to believe, that a person, who has obtained his office by the means of a bribe, whatever the nature of that bribe may be, whether consisting of money or of a vote, will ever refrain from plundering, from any other motive than that of the fear of detection. In such a case, all the effects of morality, all the influence of sentiments of honour, are completely lost to the public. That which is “conceived in sin” and brought forth in corruption,” must naturally be productive of wicked and mischievous deeds.—Now, then, the money which DOWLER paid to Mrs. Clarke we must consider as coming, through the exercise of his office, out of our pockets, whence it has first been taken by the tax-gatherer. To this we must add the probable further sums, which a man who had obtained his office by a bribe would be likely to appropriate to himself; and, when we see to what extent this system of bribery has prevailed, we shall not be surprised at the immense amount of the sums which we are annually called upon to pay on account of the Commissaries department.—In the case of offices, which are merely *military*, the mode of our suffering is different; but, it is not less real than in cases more immediately connected with money transactions. If the office be obtained by money, when no money ought to be paid, then there will be, by leaves of absence, or other means, a deduction of services due to the public; and, if money ought to be paid to the public, which is paid to a kept mistress, then the public clearly loses the amount, which ought to go to its credit. But, the chief evil here is, that unworthy and base persons are preferred before per-

sons of a different description; that the vile and corrupt vermin, who hang about the metropolis, step over the heads of veterans, who have passed their lives in toils and dangers; that boys become entrusted with commands, which ought never to be in any hands but those of men of experience; that the comfort, the happiness, the *bucks*, and the *lives*, of our brave soldiers are committed to the power of such men as Captains Donovan and Sandon and Col. French; to the power of men, whose promotion to that power has been obtained by means such as those which have now been brought to light.—Hence *desertions*; hence the *sufferings of the soldiers*; hence *blunders and failures without end*; and hence the millions upon millions, which all these annually cost us. To be a good military officer requires, not only bravery, but *wisdom, experience, and integrity*; a good understanding and a just mind. And, can these be expected in men, who have gained their posts by bribes given to a kept mistress?—Besides these, there is a positive loss in money. We pay for *more officers* than we need pay for if this infamous system did not exist. We see, in the case of one of the MALINGS, that he became a *captain* without ever having been on *military duty*. We see that others have been officers, while at *school*. Well, then, less officers are necessary; or, if that be not the case, the service must suffer, and the public must lose, by the absence of so many of those whom it pays.—I cannot refrain here from mentioning the case of MR. ADAM's son, who became the Lieut.-Colonel of a regiment *at the age of twenty-one years*. After he was appointed an *Ensign*, he was sent to *school*. His father tells us of his feats in Holland. A second commission, that of *Lieutenant*, was given him *while at school*. At the age of *sixteen* he went to Holland; and here his father says he distinguished himself in the command of a body of men usually committed to a Lieutenant. “They were from the Supplementary Militia, and required a great deal of management.” Did they so? Then, was it well to commit them to a boy of sixteen, just come from school? Should it not have been a man to have the command of such men? At twenty-one years of age no person in the world can be fit for a Lieutenant Colonel. He has the absolute command of a thousand men. The comfort, the happiness, the morality, the *bucks* of a thousand men depend upon his wisdom and integrity. A person to be intrusted with such a charge, ought to be

sober, considerate, compassionate, and yet firm to execute justice. Where are these to be found united with the passions inseparable from youth? Besides, is it possible, that the other officers, captains old enough, perhaps, to be his father, and who have every fair claim to prior promotion, can cordially submit to the command, and, occasionally, to the *reproof*, of a boy of twenty-one? What would Mr. Adam say, if he had to plead before a *judge* of twenty-one years of age? Yet, the Lieut.-Colonel of a Regiment (for the Colonel never commands) has powers still greater than those of a judge. He has, in the course of a year, to decide upon the cases of, perhaps, two thousand offences. He has to judge of characters; to weigh the merits of candidates for promotion; his smile is encouragement, and his frown disgrace; it depends upon him, whether the soldier's life be a pleasure or a curse. Is not all this too much for the age of twenty-one years?—Every desertion from the army is a loss of fifty pounds to the country; and, how many of these losses must arise from the want of wisdom and experience in commanding officers?

—But, the *cost*, the bare cost, of officers who do not actually serve, is immense. The younger Sheridan, for instance, has, it is notorious, been living in and about town all his lifetime. Yet, he was some time ago, a captain in a regiment serving abroad, and will now, I believe, be found upon the *half-pay list*. A return of all the officers belonging to regiments abroad, not serving with those regiments, would give us a view of the extent of this intolerable abuse. If men give money, or render secret services, for their offices, to a kept mistress, how can it be expected, that any service should be performed by them to the public? They give their money, or render secret services, for the sake of getting the *pay*. When Colonel French gave his money to Mrs. Clarke, it was with a view of getting three or four times the sum out of the taxes that we pay. We were the payers for Mrs. Clarke's *service of plate*; we paid for her *landau*; we paid for her *trip to Worthing*; we paid for her *wine glasses at a guinea a-piece*; we paid for her *boxes at the opera and the play-house*; and French and Sandon and Dowler and Knight and the rest of the bribing crew were merely the channel through which the money passed from the taxed people to her.—Oh! how many hundreds, how many thousands, of the people have suffered for her! She has stated, and no one

has attempted to disprove her statement ; she has stated, in answer to the very judicious questions of LORD FOLKESTONE, that she received in money from her keeper only 1,000 pounds a year ; and that this was barely sufficient to defray the expence of servants' wages and liveries ; but, that the Duke told her, if she was clever, she need never want money. Twenty thousand a year was, perhaps, not sufficient to defray the amount of all her expences. Here is 20 pounds a year taken, in taxes, from each of a thousand families. It is the maintenance of 645 labourers' families at 12s. a week, the common wages of the South of Hampshire. It is equal to the poor-rates of about 50 parishes of England and Wales, taking those parishes upon an average. It is equal to the poor-rates of 66 parishes like this of Botley. It is equal to all the direct taxes, of every sort, of 21 or 22 parishes like this. First, the farmer is deprived, by these means, of a part of his comforts and conveniences ; his house contains less of goods and displays less of hospitality ; from him the deprivation descends to the labourer, whose scanty and coarse food, and want of raiment and fuel, produce, besides the pinching of hunger and cold, the miseries of disease, and which disease, the never-failing effect of hunger and filth, is spreading far and wide its baleful and hereditary effects. How many widows and other females, whose incomes admit of no nominal augmentation, have suffered, and are still suffering from this accursed system ? Every penny paid to Mrs. Clarke is just so much taken out of the pockets of the people. All her " four or five men servants" ; all her dashing carriages ; all her wines, her music ; all her endless luxuries, have been taken from the comforts of this suffering nation, as clearly as if the tax-gatherers had taken the money and paid it in to her house-keeper or her tradesmen. That which has been devoured by her crowd of footmen, waitingwomen, pimps, and bawds, would, if the system of corruption and profligacy had not existed, been left to augment the hospitality of gentlemen, the conveniences of tradesmen and farmers, and the loaf of labourers and journeymen ; while those, her footmen, waitingwomen, pimps and bawds, would have been compelled to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow.—Taxation, when excessive, must produce misery ; and especially when the taxes are applied to the purposes of luxury. It is necessary, at this time, in particular, that the people should clearly,

perceive this truth. Suppose there to exist a community of a hundred persons, all of whom labour, in one way or another, usefully to the community. Let ten of them cease to labour, and let them live upon the labour of the other ninety ; and the consequence must be, that the ninety must work one tenth harder upon the same quantity of food, and raiment, and fuel, or that each will have one tenth less than he used to have, of these necessities of life. Hence a general decrease in productions, or a general increase of the miseries growing out of labour not sufficiently fed ; hence the fall of some into utter inability to supply their wants ; and hence the increase of the number of paupers in this country has kept an exact pace with the increase of the taxes, or, in other words, with the increase of the number of persons who are not engaged in productive labour.—The immense sums received by Mrs. Clarke were not devoured by her. She did not consume more food than before she was the Duke's kept mistress. But, she was enabled to keep a crowd of persons, of various descriptions, who, had they not been so maintained, must have laboured for their bread.—This is a view of the subject of which the people should never, for one moment, lose sight. This is the way, in which they are directly affected by the hellish system, which has now been proved to exist. From this view of it, they will not, I trust, be diverted by any attempts to induce them to attach most importance to the meanness, or even the immorality, of the parties. These are quite sufficient to excite national disgust and hatred ; but, the main thing is for the people to see the robberies, and to be able clearly to trace to these, and such like robberies, their own privations and miseries.—Now is the time for the people to ask the revilers of SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, whether he was so very much to blame, when he told the Electors of Westminster, that no good was to be expected, till we could " tear out the leaves of the accursed Red Book." Col. French, and Col. Knight, and Capt. Donovan, and Capt. Sandon, and Mr. Dowler, and the rest of the numerous petticoat-patronized crew, are all to be found in that Red Book, the leaves of which he wished to tear out. His voice will, I trust, now be heard by those who were before misled ; if, indeed, there could be any such. I trust that now, the venal declaimers about " Jacobinism " will no longer be able to blind the understanding of any man, however simple that

man may be. The man, who now affects to believe, that a *deep-rooted* system of corruption does not prevail, must be an arrant knave ; and, of course, none but an arrant knave will affect to believe, that a *radical reform* of that system, and a *speedy* one too, is not necessary to the preservation of the throne, as well as of the remaining liberties of the people.—But, in the mean time, and, indeed, as necessarily conducive to this reform, let the people bear in mind, that it is *their money* that has been sported with ; that it was not Col. French's money nor Mr. Dowler's money that the Duke of York's kept mistress took, and that was expended upon her footmen, chariots, musicians, singers, players, dancers, parasites, pimps, and bawds, but in the end, *the money of the people*. This is the important truth for them to keep in view. Let every father of a family consider how much less, from this cause, he will have to bequeath his children. When those, who formerly lived in affluence from the rent of their estates, reflect how they have been obliged to dismiss servant after servant ; sell horse after horse ; abridge pot after pot of the ale that formerly gladdened the heart of the comer ; aye, and to cut down tree after tree, and sell acre after acre ; let all such persons, when, with aching heart, they so reflect, think of Mrs. Clarke and the services of plate and the wine-glasses at a guinea a-piece and the rattling carriages and the laced-footmen and the musicians and the singing-boys and the players and the dancers and the pimps and the bawds in Gloucester Place ; and let every mind in the kingdom be fixed upon the scene described by Miss TAYLOR, every tongue repeat, and every ear tingle at, the words, “*how does French behave to Darling?*” Darling ! How many a widowed mother has had to pronounce that word over a child driven from beneath her roof by the penury produced by these and similar corruptions ! Look into families, once respectable in point of fortune, and you find them consisting of a crowd of helpless females, unable to work and ashamed to beg, the sons all forced away, for want of the means possessed by their father, to seek a subsistence from patronage, to get back again some small portion of what their father has paid in taxes, and, in order to succeed, creeping to those whom that father would have despised ; nay, perhaps, the last stake of the family is converted into a bribe for a whore, while a score of breasts are filled with anxiety lest the sum should not be

sufficient. Thus has the nation been degraded ; its spirit subdued ; its heart broken ; and its property rendered a prey to the infamous reptiles, who, at last, stand exposed to its execrations, and who, I trust, are at no great distance from the hour of feeling the effects of its vengeance. I mean not the vengeance of a mob, but the steady, sober, deliberate vengeance of the law.

I now would fain call the attention of the people to the *altered language* and tone of the House of Commons. It will not soon be forgotten, that, when Mr. Wardle first brought forward his Charges, he was answered with the boldest defiance. From both sides of the House he heard of nothing but of *joy*, that, at last, the charges against the Commander in Chief could be met in a *tangible* shape. He was told, that a conspiracy had long existed against the illustrious House of Hanover, and that his hearers were delighted to find, that they should now have fair play against that conspiracy. He was told, that he had incurred “*a heavy Responsibility*,” and that the result must be “*infamy* upon either the accused or the accuser.” Mr. Perceval said, that, “*was the present moment suitable for the statements, he believed he could enter into particulars, which would convince the House, that it was impossible to bring these alledged charges home to His Royal Highness.*” He said, in the name of the Duke, “*that his wish was, that the investigation should be most complete and public ; that there was nothing His Royal Highness so particularly deprecated as any secret or close discussion of these charges ; that, standing as that illustrious personage did, on the fairness of his character, and the fulness of the evidence he was enabled to produce in refutation of these charges, he was most particularly anxious to appear before the country, and quitted by the most accurate and severe inquiry.*” All this bold language, this tone of menace, have been dropped for some days ; and, it seems to be almost forgotten, that Mr. Wardle ever was under any very “*heavy responsibility*.” Nay, Mr. York, who spoke so roundly of the *Jacobin Conspiracy against the illustrious House of Brunswick*, seems to have begun to think, that all the “*talking*” was not without some foundation. Mr. Canning says not a word, neither does Lord Castlereagh ; Mr. William Smith, the famous Whig-Club member, thinks it no longer necessary to *disclaim* Mr. Wardle, in the name of his party ;

Mr. Whitbread is no longer in a passion at being accused of a connection with the accusing member; and the elder Sheridan talks no more of his dissuasive messages to that gentleman.—But, what is more worthy of the attention of the people is this, that now, now, now, now, behold! the East-India Company people have moved for a Committee up-stairs to inquire into the sale of *Writerships* and *Cadetships*, when it is notorious to all the world, that, for many, many years past, these offices have been *advertised* for sale as openly, and almost as frequently, as Packwood's Razor-strops or Spilsbury's pills. How comes it, that we never before heard of any Committee up-stairs, or down-stairs, or in any part of the house, to inquire into these matters? What has alarmed the honour of the Directors now? Why now, for the first time? Oh! it is very surprizing, that now, all of a sudden, this horror for jobbing should have seized them! For eight years I have been a witness of these advertisements. Every one must be satisfied, that, during that time, the traffic has been going on; and yet, not a whince have we heard from the tender Directors till now.— Still more worthy of the people's attention is what dropped from Mr. Perceval the other night, after the grand explosion, including the *Church* as well as the State. He said, he had, for some time past, had it in mind to bring in a bill to prevent this scandalous jobbing. We thought, that you and your colleagues, Sir, said, but the other day, that we were *libellers*; that we had formed a conspiracy for writing and talking down all that was great and noble in the country. Why pass a bill, if what we said was libellous? Aye, a bill, Oh! a bill; by all means a bill! But, it does come somewhat of the latest. Yes, certainly "a day after the fair." If you had talked of a bill of this sort long ago, instead of charging the press with being libellous; instead of instituting a long list of government prosecutions against those who complained of jobbing; then, indeed, we should have received your notification with applause; but, now, Sir, we do not. My neighbours, in the country, are even so irreverent as to laugh at it; and, though I caution them against the consequence of giving way to ridicule upon state affairs, they still persist in comparing it to maternal precautions when the girl's shape convicts her of bastardy. These country people are slow to move. They are as obstinate in their credulity as they are in their want of faith. At last they see their situation

plainly; and I venture to say, that nothing short of a fair, full, entire, radical reform of abuses and corruptions will now satisfy them. The farmers have read about Mr. Beazley, and Drs. Glasse and O'Meara. They did not like *tithes* before; and, be you assured, that they will not now like them any thing the better. They are a strange people; always judging of what they cannot get a sight of by what they can get a sight of. If they see a full sack, for instance, and perceive wheat dropping out, through an accidental hole, in the sack, they conclude that the sack is filled with wheat. This logic they apply to clerical preferments, and look upon Mr. Beazley, the *no-popery pamphlet writer*, and Drs. Glasse and O'Meara, as the grains that have dropped out.—"A bill" will never satisfy such people. They do not so easily perceive the virtues of such a bill. In short, they heard enough of bills to check the Treasurer of the Navy. They want something to make them *see* and *feel*, that they *cannot* again be robbed by infamous jobbers; and, until they have this, bills will be of no use. But, what is to become of *all the past*? Or is this bill to be, by implication, a bill of *indemnity* for the past? Is there *no law* to punish the jobbing rascals? Bless us! no law, of any sort, by which they can be come at? Why not apply to them that most convenient and accommodating thing, called the *law of libel*? Give me a file of news-papers, or go to Peel's Coffee-House, and I will engage you shall have some thousands of advertisements for the purchase and sale of offices under government. I have, several times, pointed out to the ministry these scandalous advertisements. I have, more than once, taken them for mottos, a sort of text, whereon to preach a political sermon to them. I have asked why the authors of those advertisements were not called upon. No notice has ever been taken of my representations. Nay, on the very day when Mr. Wardle's Charges were brought forward; so late as that day, and after the charges had been stated, Mr. Perceval seemed to think very lightly of the matter. He said, that, *in this great metropolis*, there were "foolish people," who were, by such advertisements, induced to throw away their money; but, as to the actual sale of places, he scouted the idea. Not a word did he, even at that late day, say about a bill to prevent jobbing. He now tells the House, that he has, for *some time*, thought of this bill. It is not for a very long time, it seems. On the contrary, the

whole of the language of himself and his colleagues was the language of *defiance*. Every thing they said was in *opposition* to the charges of Mr. Wardle; not a soul of them allowed, that corruption existed in any shape. No, the whole cry was, that a conspiracy was on foot “against every thing *great* and *noble*;” that Jacobinism was still alive, and that what the late Pitt said of its malignant qualities was now verified; in short, every thing that could be said was said to make us believe, that the charges had had their rise in the licentiousness of the press, and in a conspiracy against all the establishments of the country, not excepting the kingly office. *Denial* was the word; all was denial and defiance; and not a breath about a *bill* to prevent jobbing. Where have the 658 members of the House been living, that they, that no one of them, ever saw cause for such a bill before? It is strange, passing strange, that this talk about a *bill*, this plain acknowledgment that jobbing does exist, should never have been made *before*. Has it sprung up, all at once, under Mr. Perceval and Mr. Canning and Lord Castlereagh? Oh, no! It is a very deep-rooted plant. Aye, and a *bill* will not grub it up. Of that the whole nation is convinced.

It is of the greatest importance for the people, by which term I mean all those who are not in the receipt of the public money, or any part of it, to bear in mind what passed at the time when Mr. Wardle first brought his Charges forward. I was aware of this; I knew that every word then uttered would become of more and more consequence as the investigation proceeded. For this reason, I was induced to depart from my usual practice, and to insert the debate entire. As it cannot be too often read, I will now remind the public, that the first part will be found at page 163, the continuation at page 196, and the conclusion, if I have room, at the close of this sheet. To this debate, as to a standard, I shall constantly refer. It is by looking back, that we are enabled to judge of what we have to expect. We are too apt always to forget the past. When any thing of interest arises, we attach our attention solely to that; but this is wrong; for, in fact, we see but half the thing without taking into view what has gone before. —This being my opinion, I will now endeavour to lead the abused people back to the beginning of the formal, public complaints, made in behalf of the Duke of York against the press; and, this is the

more necessary, because it seems to me, that every public writer appears to have forgotten them.—For more than a year past there have been, occasionally, little dirty pamphlets, complaining of *libels* against the Duke of York; but, they were so insufferably stupid, that no man of sense thought it worth his while to notice them.

—In the month of August, however, when there had been published some pretty bold paragraphs against the Duke’s being sent to Spain, there was published a pamphlet, entitled “A PLAIN STATEMENT ‘OF THE CONDUCT OF THE MINISTRY AND ‘THE OPPOSITION TOWARDS HIS ROYAL ‘HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF YORK.” It was in this pamphlet, as the public will not soon forget, that it was stated, that there existed “a family council, a domestic cabinet,” to protect the king even against his ministers; that the Queen was at the head of this council, and the Duke of York a leading member of it.—The pamphlet states, in substance, that the late ministry wished, and even attempted, greatly to abridge the power of the Duke of York; and, observe it well, the writer adds, “that his royal highness deemed it necessary to throw himself upon the protection of his ROYAL FATHER; and that the proposed measure of the Grenville party was thus defeated by the immediate interposition, not to say the COMMAND of his Majesty.” It is of great importance; it is of incalculable importance, that we now look back to these publications. But, the part of this memorable pamphlet (the writer of which has never been prosecuted) adapted more immediately to our present purpose, is that which relates to the complaints, made by this writer against both ministries for NOT INTERFERING WITH THE NEWS-PAPERS, in order to prevent publications against the Duke. Every word of this part of the pamphlet is now to be re-perused and treasured up in the memory. Here is the passage, and I do beseech the people of this kingdom to read it over and over again.—“These incessant attacks could not but very seriously affect his royal highness, and after having maintained a dignified reserve as long as human patience could support it, he at length found it necessary to demand an inquiry into his conduct. —Nothing could be so ridiculous as the affected astonishment of the ministry upon this demand. Who has presumed to attack the interest or the reputation of your royal highness? There are laws in the country to which your royal highness may appeal. Why should there be a

" formal inquiry where there is no formal charge? Why should the ignorance or malignity of the daily papers be raised into the consequence and dignity of having called forth an official inquiry? If any thing has been said or written against your royal highness, of which all his majesty's ministers must solemnly disavow even any knowledge, the Attorney General should be ordered forthwith to commence a prosecution; and if your royal highness be unwilling personally to give your instructions to that officer of the crown, *they may be given to the treasury, by your royal highness's secretary.* But his majesty's ministers would think themselves deficient in a due sense of what they owed to their own dignity as his majesty's counsellors, if they adopted a popular rumour as sufficient grounds for an official inquiry."

—Well, this was pretty well, I think. What more did this writer wish them to do? He will tell us directly, in speaking of what he says has been the conduct of the present ministry, upon a similar occasion.—" It may be urged, indeed, in reply to all that has been said above, that the attacks complained of, have not been made with the knowledge, and still less with the consent or concurrence of his majesty's ministers: that they are all of them too honourable men to concur in such a system of anonymous attack: that such a system, moreover, could answer no conceivable purpose: that the ministry are too strong in public opinion and confidence, to require the assistance of such unworthy arts. In a word, that such a persecution, and so indirectly put into operation, can have no purpose, and therefore that it is a reasonable inference that it has no existence.—To this it must be answered, that when his royal highness made similar representations, under the late ministry, the answer was uniformly, that his majesty's ministers were totally ignorant of the very existence of the facts alleged; that the law was open to his royal highness, and that the Attorney General might be instructed to prosecute; that they had no influence or authority over the free press; and that they advised his royal highness to hold all such libellous accusation in the contempt which it merited. —It is notorious, however, notwithstanding all this disavowal, that the free press, as it is called, and as it should be, is almost equally divided between the two leading parties in the country, and that the

" ministers and the opposition have the same influence, NOT TO SAY AUTHORITY, over them as if they were THE ACTUAL EDITORS. Has any instance ever occurred, in which a billet from Downing-street has been refused admission, and if required, an ample confirmatory comment, through all the Treasury papers? And will any, either of the ministry or the opposition, declare, upon their honour as gentlemen, that they have no authority or weight with the public papers? Whence does it happen, that the honour of parties is not the same with that of individuals, and that a party will assert conjunctively, what every individual of that party knows to be false? Why is there not the same point of honour with a party as with an individual?—The indecent language in the daily papers, is certainly not from the mouth of the ministers. It is impossible that men of honourable stations should descend to such terms, and to such anonymous acrimony. We are persuaded that his royal highness most fully acquits his majesty's ministers of any immediate participation in such libels. But the encouragement, the countenance, the impunity, of these libellers, is the efficient cause of the whole. Would the Editors of the Daily Papers thus write, unless they were persuaded that they were advocating a cause generally pleasing to their patrons? As to a legal remedy for this torrent of libel and invective, though a jury of his countrymen would visit the libellers with merited punishment, his royal highness, we believe, will not be lightly persuaded to introduce a practice which he has never approved. There have been perhaps already too many government prosecutions, and a precedent may thus be constituted, which, much to the injury of the free press, may be hereafter acted upon. Add to this that there may be innumerable allusions, inuendoes, and even assertions, which may have substance enough to wound, and that most deeply, but are not palpable enough for the visitation of the law. The libellers of his royal highness have been too long practised in their school, to commit themselves to the hands of a jury. Let any man of honest feelings read some of the cold-blooded articles which have lately appeared in many of the daily papers, and then answer, if his indignation be not moved by their savage malignity—yet are these libels conceived in terms so studiously picked and culled, as to elude

*“the just vengeance of the law.”—How many subjects, moreover, are there which, however grossly offensive to all honourable feeling, cannot be produced to the publicity of a legal trial. Let any man put it to his own mind—how many slanderous reports are daily in circulation to the ruin of the peace and character of their unhappy object, but for which the sufferer is yet unwilling to make his appeals to the laws of his country. There is a necessary and indiscriminating publicity in law, from which a mind of any DELICACY cannot but wert. His royal highness has indeed suffered much, but he will suffer still more, we should think, before he can persuade himself to call on the laws of his country.”*

So, here we have an expression of this writer's wishes. He seems to allow, that nothing has been said of the Duke that even our libel law can lay its fangs upon, or, at least, with a fair chance of success; and, therefore, as the newspapers are, as he says, as completely at the command of the two parties; as if the leaders of those parties were the actual editors; and as, with regard to the Treasury papers, “a billet from Downing Street is never refused admittance, accompanied, if required, by an ample confirmatory comment,” he would have had orders issued from Downing Street, to those papers, to insert certain billets and to refuse others, relating to the Duke of York.—This writer must be an enemy of the Duke, under the mask of friendship; for is it possible to form an idea of any thing more low, more mean, more shabby, more scurvy, more dirty, more base, than going to a ministry, and asking them to obtain the publication or the suppression of paragraphs, respecting him, in prints, which he must regard as being edited by the most venal of mankind? As if he had said to himself: no; the law will not do; the law cannot find any hold in the publications against me, and beside I do not like the publicity of law; I will, therefore, have recourse to corruption; I will, by the means of influence purchased with the public money, get a good word from those whom I despise. This is what this writer imputes to the Duke of York, and this he does under the mask of friendly compassion. This he does under the pretence of defending the royal chieftain against the attacks of his calumniators. I do not believe that any act more base was ever before imputed to any human being. What, go sneaking to the ministry to beg of them to speak a good word for

him to the editors of the newspapers! Foh! it is so rank, it so stinks of meanness, that one's bowels are disordered at the thought, especially when imputed to a modern “CORIOLANUS.” I am not for appeals to the law, respecting matters of this sort; but, something should certainly be done by the real friends of the Duke of York, to convince the world, that this part at least, of the pamphleteer's statements is false. I, for my part, shall anxiously wait for the contradiction, and shall hasten to give it to the world. What! (I cannot get it out of my mind) go to the ministry to supplicate their interference with the public papers! It is such an abominable story; such atrocious slander, that surely it will be speedily contradicted.—Such is the passage, and such were my remarks upon it at the time. To this the writer added, in a very positive and peremptory tone, that the ministry and opposition, must, when parliament met, both DISAVOW the attacks of the press upon the Duke. How far this positive prediction, not to call it a threat, has been fulfilled, I leave the people to judge, when they have again carefully looked over the debate upon Mr. Wardle's Charges, bearing in mind, at the same time, the disavowal of Mr. W. Smith, in the name of his party, the anger of Mr. Whitbread, at being suspected to have given encouragement to Mr. Wardle, and the declaration of Mr. Sheridan, relative to a foul “conspiracy.”—Here then, People of England, you have seen the origin of all these complaints against the press; I mean the first formal published complaint. Since that publication MAJOR HOGAN's Pamphlet edited by the able pen of Mr. Finnerty, has appeared. In consequence of that pamphlet many prosecutions by the Attorney General have been commenced. Major Hogan's pamphlet boldly speaks of *petticoat promotions*; it states, that the Major, who is proved, by letters from most respectable superiors, to be a man of long and very meritorious services, told the Duke, that his long-sought promotion might have been obtained, at a reduced price, if he had, like others, chosen to disgrace himself by applying to petticoat influence; that the Major was ready to produce to the Duke proof that promotions were thus disposed of; that the Duke made no answer to him; and that he (Major Hogan) has never been called on for his proof. There could be no harm at all in the Major's saying, that he stated this to the Duke; the harm consisted in his stating,

that the Duke made him no answer, and never called for his proofs; and, if this statement was false, it was very wicked and richly deserving of punishment; because the direct and inevitable tendency of it was to cause it to be believed, that such villainous influence, influence so manifestly disgraceful and injurious to both the army and the public, was used with the knowledge and connivance of the Duke, than which a heavier charge could not have been preferred against mortal existing.—It must be confessed, that this pamphlet had a wonderfully great effect all over the country. I recommended it to the attention of my readers; because I foresaw, that, whether true or false, it must finally bring to an open discussion, that question, which had, for several years, been agitated in private, and of the importance of which question I from my correspondence, was better able to judge than the public in general.—*Prosecutions* were now resorted to, in which prosecutions Mr. Finnerty, and the printer and venders of Major Hogan's pamphlet are involved, and of course, were so involved at the date of Mr. Wardle's bringing forward his charges. But, in the meanwhile, many people appear to have been busy in their inquiries; and, at last Mr. Wardle, who had been successful in his inquiries, comes before the parliament, and, without applying to any party for support, or assistance, boldly makes the complaint, and prefers the charges, in the name of a burdened, an injured, and insulted people.—Now, then, we come to the *reception* which those Charges met with upon their first appearance. They were stated with a degree of frankness unparalleled. The accuser not only explicitly stated the nature of the several cases; he gave the details; and he even named his witnesses; leaving to the accused every possible advantage, especially if we consider of what description those witnesses were, what was their situation in life, and what was their manifest interest as connected with the cases whereon they were to be called, it being almost impossible that scarcely any one of them should support the charges, without, in the same breath, proclaiming their own infamy, or, at best, their meanness.—This procedure, so frank, so honest, so manifestly free from all desire to take advantage, was met with observations on the “heavy responsibility” to which the accuser had exposed himself; with charges against unnamed “jacobin conspirators,” who had formed a

settled scheme for writing and talking down the Duke of York, the army, and all the establishments in the country; with the severest censure upon the press, the recent “licentiousness” of which was represented as surpassing that of all former times, and the benefits of the freedom of which were, in the opinions of very good men, overbalanced by the evils of its licentiousness; with representations of the difficulty of producing convictions for obvious libels. Nor, must we fail to keep fresh in our minds, that, just before the parliament met, and while so many persons were under government-prosecution for alleged libels upon the Duke of York, we saw daily advertised in all the news-papers, “THOUGHTS ON LIBELS, ON JURIES, and on ‘the DIFFICULTIES OF PRODUCING CONVICTION in the case of libel,’” which Thoughts were “dedicated to the Duke of York and ‘Albany,’” and published by EGERTON, the Horse-Guards bookseller. At the same time, just upon the eve of the meeting of parliament, a person of the name of WHARTON, said to be the same who is Chairman of the Committee of the House of Commons, published a pamphlet entitled, “Remarks on the Jacobinical tendency of the Edinburgh Review, in a letter ‘to the Earl of Lonsdale;’” in which stupid Letter the author talks of libels, and of settled schemes, on the part of the press, to overthrow the establishments of the country.—Whereunto these publications tended was evident enough. Their natural tendency, supposing them to have answered the purpose for which they were written, was, first to create in the public mind, an alarm for the internal peace and safety of the country; to cause it to be believed, that, somewhere or other, there was a conspiracy brooding against the government; that this conspiracy was aided, in its diabolical views, by the press; that, of course, it was the duty of juries to get over the difficulties which had heretofore been experienced in the producing of conviction in cases of libel; and if all this should fail, to prepare the minds of the public for new, and still more severe laws, with respect to the press, providing a complete security for every great offender in future.—That such was the tendency of these publications is quite clear, and, I think, there can be very little doubt of its having been their principal, if not their sole, object. This object has, by Mr. Wardle's exertions, been, for the present, at least, defeated. The Lord Chancellor has declared, in his place, in the House of

Lords, that the laws in existence, relative to the press, are a sufficient check upon it. And, well might he make the declaration! For, what further checks can be devised, what greater dangers a writer or publisher can be exposed to, without establishing, at once, an imprimatur, and the power of transportation without trial, such as they have at Calcutta, I am at a loss to discover. We cannot now plead *the truth* in justification of what we write and publish. It has now been *proved*, thanks to Mr. Wardle, that there has, for years and years, been carried on a regular trade in military commissions and in appointments of all sorts. But, if I had happened to *know*, that French and Sandon gave money to Mrs. Clarke for their letter of service, and that, in consequence of that bribe, they obtained their levy from the Duke of York; if I had happened to *know* this; if I had stated it; and if I had been prosecuted by the Attorney General for the statement, I should not have been able, according to the present practice of the law, to produce, in my defence, *the proof of the truth of my statement*, nor would my accusers have been called upon for *proof of their falsehood*. All that would have been requisite to my conviction would have been the proof that I was the proprietor of the paper, and a thorough opinion, in the minds of the jury, that my statement was of a sort to *hurt the reputation, or even the feelings, of either of the parties*; and, thus, I might have been torn from my family, and shut up in Gloucester or Dorchester jail for years, as a sacrifice to the wounded feelings of a *peculating pimp*. And yet, there are men, who have the assurance to tell us, that the press is still too free; and that the difficulties in the way of conviction, in cases of libel, are still too great!—Had not this, such as I have described it, been the state of the press; had not the danger of publishing truth been so great; can any one believe, that the enormities, the atrocious deeds, that have now come to light, would have been carried on for so many years? Why, I have had hundreds of letters upon the subject; but, I had no taste for either Gloucester or Dorchester jail; and, therefore, the knowledge thus communicated to me, was confined to my own indignant breast, or, at most, extended a little by the means of conversation.—If *truth* had not been a *libel*, those injuries to the nation would have been stopped in time, or, rather, they never would have had an existence. They would have been prevented by the dread of ex-

posure; but, the press being enslaved so far as not to dare to speak the truth; as not to dare to utter what might *hurt the feelings* of any one, whether guilty or not; this being so notoriously the case, there was no danger of exposure, and, of course, the corruption and profligacy went on increasing, until they arrived at the pitch in which they now appear before us.

There is one way, and that a most effectual one, of silencing the press; of silencing both *writers* and *talkers*; namely, by *reforming*; by taking from the people the grounds of complaint; by ceasing to wrong and to insult them. But, this is a way that never seems to have been thought of. It is all to be done by *force*; by the law, or by the bayonet. These may silence, but they never convince; they smother for a while, but they do not extinguish the fire of discontent; as the fate of all the old corrupt governments of the continent has clearly demonstrated.—Conspiracy against the *establishments*, indeed! No, no! There is no jacobinical conspiracy: it is a conspiracy of such persons as the Reverend Drs. Glasse, and O'Meara, and the Reverend Mr. Beazley, who, when they took priests orders, declared, *that they were therunto moved by the Holy Ghost*. It is these persons, if what has been given in evidence be true; it is these, and such-like persons, who are conspiring against the established church. It is impossible, that the people should believe, that these are the *only* instances of the kind that have existed; it is impossible, that the general opinion should not be, that *many* of the clergy have been preferred by the means, which were employed in behalf of these persons; and, as the people cannot know precisely where to fix, it will necessarily follow, that their suspicions will fall upon the clergy as a *body*; and, then, who can be surprised, if the churches should become *quite*, instead of three-fourths, deserted? It is a very great hardship upon the worthy part of the clergy, that they should suffer in reputation from this cause; but, it is inevitable now, and the blame will not lie upon the people, but on those, who have carried on, who have winked at, and who have tolerated, these corruptions.—These observations apply to the army also, the general character of the officers of which must greatly suffer from what is now come to light. Who can tell which officer has, and which has not, obtained his promotion by bribing or pimping? Mr. Yorke said, there was a conspiracy to

write down the army, through the Duke of York. What is the House of Commons at now? Is not it hard at work to pull down the reputation of the officers of the army? After this, is it possible, that the people should think, as they before thought, of rank in the military profession? Nay, is it possible, that the *non-commissioned officers and soldiers* should not have a quite new set of ideas respecting their officers? Is it not shocking, that the *backs* of hundreds of our brave countrymen should be committed to the power of a wretch, who has been base enough to purchase that power with a bribe to a kept-mistress? The case of good and honourable men, who hold offices in the army is very hard. At present it is impossible to know, who are the petticoat officers and who are not. The suspicions of the public and the soldiers must be divided amongst the whole body of officers; and the whole body must suffer accordingly. Was it not then, with good reason, that SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, in the last session of parliament, wished to provide some legal checks upon the power of the Commander in Chief?

—The same reasoning will still apply to the Royal Family itself. It is not *possible*, that the people should look upon that Family with the same eyes that they did before this explosion took place. First, the Duke of York is one of that family. Next, the question, *how the rest of the family never came to hear of any of these corruptions*, must, and will, pass through the mind of every man in the kingdom. I wish to guard my readers, and, as far as I am able, the people in general, from any hasty suspicions of this sort. A father and mother are, generally, the last who hear of the faults of their children. None of us would think it just to be suspected of participating in the vices of our sons and daughters. But, we may be reasonably allowed to ask, what the *advisers* of the king have been about all this time? Where they have lived, what society they have frequented, that they have never discovered the existence of any part of all that, which has now been brought to light? If there was such a *writing* and such a *talking* against the Duke of York, was it not their duty to have inquired into the matter? and, had they not all the means of coming at the truth? When they saw the statements of Major Hogan, ought they not to have sent for Major Hogan, and have examined him upon the subject? Did not their duty to the king, as his sworn advisers, demand

this at their hands? The pamphlet entitled “A PLAIN STATEMENT, &c.” says, indeed, that the *late ministry* made an attempt to abridge the power of the Duke, and that a stop was put to their project “by ‘the immediate interference of the king,’” but, their duty was, to go to the king with a full and fair representation of the reasons why they wished to abridge that power. To state *painful truths* is what a faithful counsellor is wanted for. There are always people enough about a court to flatter, and to tell what is pleasing to the ear of a king; and, how many kings have we seen come tumbling from their thrones, in only a few weeks after their flatterers had taught them to believe, that all was safety! —If the king had had wise and upright advisers, should we have ever seen a grant like that mentioned in the motto to this sheet? Such advisers would not have failed to perceive, and to point out to their master, the bad impression which such a grant of the public money, at a time like the present, must have upon the minds of his people. Such advisers would have reminded him, that the people could not fail to ask what *services* this lady (though a virtuous person, and whose case is a very hard one) had performed for them, or for the crown, to merit such an income out of the *public purse*, at a time when the *Captains of the Navy* are supplicating for a small addition to their pay. Such advisers would have pressed upon the king, who would, we must believe, have, at once, followed their advice, to abstain from all grants, either direct or indirect, to his own family, while his people were so heavily burdened, and while fresh sacrifices of their comforts, and even necessities, were annually called for, upon the ground of their being wanted for the defence of the country against a foreign invader. —If the king had had wise and upright advisers, should we ever have seen the news-papers announcing, under the head of “court news,” the movements of Mrs. JORDAN and her family, backward and forward, between *Bushy Park* and *St. James’s Palace*? If the king had had wise and upright advisers, should we ever have seen publications, like the following, circulated through all the news-papers of the kingdom! “The Duke of Clarence’s birth-day was “celebrated with much splendour in *Bushy Park*, on Thursday. The grand hall was “entirely new fitted up, with bronze pilasters, and various marble imitations; the “ceiling very correctly clouded, and the “whole illuminated with some brilliant

" patent lamps, suspended from a beautiful eagle. The dining room in the right wing was fitted up in a modern style, " with new elegant lamps at the different entrances. The pleasure ground was disposed for the occasion, and the servants had new liveries. In the morning " the Dukes of York's and Kent's bands arrived in caravans; after dressing themselves and dining, they went into the pleasure grounds, and played alternately some charming pieces. The Duke of Kent's played some of the choruses and movements from Haydn's Oratorio of the CREATION, arranged, by command of his Royal Highness, for a band of wind instruments. About five o'clock the Prince of Wales, the Dukes of York, Kent, Sussex, and Cambridge, Colonel Paget, &c. arrived, from reviewing THE GERMAN LEGION. After they had dressed for dinner, they walked in the pleasure grounds, accompanied by the Lord Chancellor, Earl and Countess of Athlone and daughter, Lord Leicester, Baron Hotham and Lady, Baron Eden, the Attorney General, Colonels Paget and M'Mahon, Serjeant Marshall, and a number of other persons. At seven o'clock the second bell announced the dinner, when THE PRINCE took MRS. JORDAN by the hand, led her into the dining room, and seated her at the head of the table. The Prince took his seat at her right hand, and the Duke of York at her left; the Duke of Cambridge sat next to the Prince, the Duke of Kent next to the Duke of York, and the Lord Chancellor next to his Royal Highness. The DUKE OF CLARENCE sat at the foot of the table.—It is hardly necessary to say the table was sumptuously covered with every thing the season could afford. The bands played on the lawn, close to the dining-room window. The populace were permitted to enter the pleasure grounds to behold the Royal Banquet, while the presence of Messrs. Townshend, Sayers, and Macnamas, preserved the most correct decorum. The Duke's NUMEROUS FAMILY were introduced, and admired by the Prince, the Royal Dukes, and the whole company; an infant in arms, with a most beautiful white head of hair, was brought into the dining-room by the nursery maid. After dinner the Prince gave "The Duke of Clarence," which was drank with three times three. The Duke gave "The King," which was drank in a similar manner. A discharge of cannon from the lawn

" followed. "The Queen and Princesses."—"The Duke of York and the Army." His Royal Highness's band then struck up *his celebrated march.*"—This article was contained in the Courier news-paper of the 3rd of August, 1806; and, as the people will have observed, many such articles have appeared since, while not one of them has been contradicted. Now, if there was any truth in such statements, would not wise and upright counsellors have advised the king to put a stop to the grounds of such statements? Must not the people, upon reading such accounts, call to mind the king's Proclamation for the suppression of Vice; and also, as if the laws were insufficient for keeping the common people in order, the erection of self-created societies for the purpose? And, will they not now ask of those pious societies, why, when they were pursuing the poor whores with their day-light lanthorns, they never thought of a lanthorn for Gloucester Place? These godly gentlemen, no small part of whom, by-the-bye, derive their incomes from the public purse, appear to have eyes so constructed as to see vice only when she is accompanied with poverty. They fish with a net that will hold nothing but the small fry.—There is one of Mrs. JORDAN's sons in the navy, and another in the army. The latter has been described to me as a very little boy. A gentleman, who saw him in Spain, described him as not being much bigger than a son of mine who is only about ten years of age. He must, however, be older, and, it is probable, that he is fourteen years of age, or more. But, then, observe, he is a cornet in the tenth Regiment of Lt. Dragoons, of which the Prince of Wales is Colonel; that he is even the second cornet upon the list; and that, according to the army-list now before me, he is senior to four other cornets. When in Spain, he was an *aid-de-camp*, and, a gentleman who frequently had occasion to see the quarters of the dragoons, saw his name upon a door, signifying that the apartment was his, a mark of distinction not used by common subaltern officers. Yet, this person could, by those subalterns, and by the officers in general, be looked upon as no other than the son of Mrs. JORDAN; than the son of a play-actress; than the son of a person, whom, but a day or two, perhaps, before their departure from England, several of those officers had seen, in the character of NELL JOBSON, pawing Bannister's dirty face.—Aye, Mr. Yorke, say what you like,

these, *these* are the things that create discontent and disgust; these are the things that gall; these are the things that sting the soul; and sting they will in spite of all that can be said or preached about jacobinical conspiracies. Oh, Sir! We, surely, are not *all* jacobins; we, surely, are not *all* conspirators; but, with the exception of those, who participate in corruptions, like those that have come to light, we *all* feel alike with respect to these things. No, Sir, the "illustrious House of Brunswick" is in no danger from conspiracies amongst the people, or any part of the people. *Writers* and *talkers* have no power to hurt any thing established, any thing settled by law, and defended by all the constables and judges and an army to boot, unless that establishment *undermine itself*. "Philosophy," Sir Francis Burdett observed, in one of his early speeches, in answer to those who ascribed the fall of the old French government to the writings of an anti-christian philosophical conspiracy; "Philosophy has no such trophies to boast; the trophies are due solely to the corruption and profligacy of those, who have fallen a sacrifice to the vengeance of a people at first discontented, next indignant, next enraged, and at last, enfurated, urged on by a mad and indiscriminating spirit of revenge." From such a catastrophe, Sir, God preserve the Royal Family of England! But, Sir, let no part of that family disregard the feelings of the people. Let them bear in mind the words of Burke: "What a base and foolish thing it is for any consolidated body of authority to say, or to act as if it said: 'I will put my trust, not in mine own virtue, but in your patience; I will indulge in effeminity, in indolence, in corruption; I will give way to all my perverse and vicious humours; because you cannot punish me without ruining yourselves.'" These words, written in letters to be read at half a mile distance, should be seen upon the top of every public edifice. They should be imprinted on the hearts of princes, and of all persons in authority. Yet, in direct contradiction to the wise precept contained in them, we are continually asked, by the venal writers of the day: "how," if we dislike this or that, of which we complain; "how we should like Buonaparté and his government?" Just as if it were necessary for us to have the one or the other; just as if we had no choice but that between Buonaparté and Mrs. Clarke! Of all the insults, which we have had to bear, this is the greatest. When we complain, that we

are not as our forefathers were, these venal wretches do not attempt to deny the fact, but fall to giving us a description of the state of the people *in France*; and look upon their triumph as being complete, when they have asserted, that it is possible for us to be worse off than we are; that there is *one nation* in the world who have less liberty than we. When we complain of the weight of the taxes, the answer is, that Buonaparté would *take all*; and, in short, the tenor of the whole of the writings of these venal scribes is, to silence our complaints by saying, that we must submit to any thing, *no matter what*, or that Buonaparté shall come and put chains round our legs and necks.—And is it reasoning like this, or rather, these impudent and insulting assertions, that will induce us cheerfully to give up the necessities of life, and shed our blood in the country's defence? "The country," says Burke, in the passage above quoted from; "The country, to be saved, must have warm advocates and passionate defenders, which heavy discontented acquiescence never can produce." If this proposition did not carry in itself the evidence of its truth, that truth would now, one would think, have been forced by experience, the teacher even of fools, upon every mind. The map of Europe laid before us, where is the spot, which does not afford an awful lesson to those, who are still disposed "to put their trust in the patience of the people?" who are still disposed to say, or to act as if they said, "we will give way to all our perverse and vicious humours, because you cannot punish us without the hazard of ruining your selves?" On how many a spot will that map enable us to lay our fingers, where the people, whose patience had been exhausted, who had long been yielding "a heavy and discontented acquiescence," have been disposed to punish, aye, and have punished, their rulers at all hazards, and that too, without appearing to care whether or not their own ruin would be the consequence! With these lessons before them, what must we think of those whose language tends to encourage such of the great as indulge in their vicious humours; instead of warning them of their danger? These are the *real* enemies of the king's family and government; these are the real enemies of "the illustrious house of Brunswick;" these, who, when they should speak wholesome truths to them, pour in their ears the poison of flattery; these, who, when they should recommend to

them conciliating language and conduct, urge them on to reproachful words and vindictive deeds ; these, who, when they should show their gratitude for the timely, the gentle, the humble, admonitions of the press, fall to loading it with accusations, and turn against it every shaft in the quiver of the law.—What would have been the course of wise counsellors, even at the late hour, when Mr. Wardle preferred the accusations ? They would have begged him to stay his public proceedings ; they would have verified the truth with his assistance ; they would then have made, in a message from the king himself, a candid statement, to the parliament and the people, of the whole of the circumstances, however painful to state ; and then, as coming from the king, they would have proposed, and at once adopted ; such measures, as to the past as well as the future, as would have drawn from the people an unanimous exclamation of “ *this is just.* ” How different would the effect of this course have been from the effect of the course which has been pursued ? How very different with respect to the whole of the government and the establishments of the kingdom, and especially with respect to the person and family of the king ? All that would then have been gained, would, by this nation, never wanting in forgiveness or in gratitude, have been received as a boon ; all that is now gained will be looked upon as extorted. In the former case, the candour of the proceeding would have excited confidence for the future, and would even have called forth all the milder feelings in mitigation of the past ; now, let the result be what it will, suspicion will lie brooding at bottom, and, in its own justification, will still preserve the past in all its hideous and hateful colours. This is consulting human nature ; but, when did ministers and courtiers consult human nature, or any thing else but their own passions, or their own immediate interests ? All the old governments of the continent have clung to their corruptions, till their hold has been cut, till it has been hacked off. They have never begun to reform till it was too late ; never till compelled, and who is there that feels grateful for a compulsory compliance ? Such a compliance never produces reconciliation : one party hates and the other suspects : the feelings only change bosoms : it is merely a suspension of open hostilities : the contest is soon again renewed ; and the final consequence is sure to be the destruction of the government, or the complete absolute slavery

of the people. Thus has it uniformly been in all the struggles between a government and a people ; and I most anxiously hope, that, by turning the minds of all considerate men to thoughts on a *radical and timely reform here*, I may contribute in some small degree, towards the salvation of our once happy and still beloved country.

Botley, Wednesday, 15th Feb. 1809.

*Debate of the 27th January, concluded from page 203.*

He surely must be aware, that having undertaken the *responsible* task of submitting to a British House of Commons such a serious accusation, that whatever may be the issue of its deliberation ; in whatever view the House shall consider the transactions which he has disclosed, whether they be refuted or substantiated, *infamy* must attach *somewhere*—either upon the accused or the accuser.—From the *system* which has been *deliberately* pursued for some time past, by the enemies of h. r. h. the Commander in Chief, he had to *congratulate* that illustrious personage, and at the same time to *thank* the hon. mover, for the opportunity of canvassing the subject upon charges preferred in a tangible shape. *Whatever result* may ensue from such accusations, it was *not to be denied*, that that royal personage had been subjected to the systematic *calumnies* of a set of *unprincipled libellers* ; that in their vile and malignant publications he had been treated with a brutality of insult which almost made *good men hesitate in deciding, whether the value of a free discussion was not considerably depreciated by the evils of its unbridled licentiousness*. For the last six months scarce a day elapsed without some fresh attack upon his honour and his feelings. There was a co-operation of cowardice with falsehood, which far exceeded the calumnious profligacy of other times. A cowardice too of the *basest* kind, participating of the most depraved and odious qualities, deserving of that execration which the best feelings of humanity would pronounce on the base assailant of *female weakness*, because to direct unfounded attacks against those in *high authority*, was nearly similar to an attack on an *undefended woman*. It was therefore, as sincerely interested in the honour and reputation of his royal highness, that he rejoiced to find that this question had taken a distinct shape, and that in the due and proper place, the period for *ineculpation*, and he was sure of *exculpation*, had arrived (*hear ! hear !*). It

was for parliament to give the subject the fullest inquiry, but he trusted that the hon. mover would in the first instance, without any subsequent restriction, direct his proofs to the specific objects on which his charges of that night were founded.

Mr. WHITBREAD concurred heartily in the recommendation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the most public inquiry. It was due to the elevated rank of the illustrious personage accused, and to the great interests of the country, which were so implicated in the issue. The right hon. Secretary had assumed as a fact, that such a conspiracy as he described, existed, and upon that assumption he rested all his arguments. If such a conspiracy did exist, every man must lament, that such a character, elevated in rank and influence, should be exposed to unmerited calumny.—Still it was to be presumed and hoped, that a prince of the house of Hanover would prefer even suffering under such attacks, rather than risque the liberty of that Press to which that family and the British empire owed so much. But why was this brutality of insult so long suffered to continue? Were the Attorney and Solicitor Generals asleep, and the other law officers of the crown asleep? How came it that they neglected their duty? He was ready to give them credit that the omission was not intentional. (*A laugh.*) There was one point in the speech of the right hon. Secretary from which he must dissent. It was assumed by him, that if the result should, as he trusted, acquit his royal highness, his hon. friend would be *infamous* for preferring the accusation. Such doctrine was not supported either by the spirit or usage of the constitution. If there were justifiable grounds for his charge, or if information of a strong kind was laid before him, it was his bounden duty, as an honest public servant, to act upon it in that house. In compliance with that sense of duty, his hon. friend did submit the subject to the House, and whatever might be the issue, he was convinced that not a particle of dishonour could attach to him (Mr. Wardle). There was one strong reason that it should go to a Committee of the House, which weighed particularly with him—namely, that it would be impossible to select any set of names that would satisfy this herd of libellers and calumniators, of which such mention had been made by the right hon. Secretary.

Lord CASTLEREAGH supported the opinion, that such a CONSPIRACY did exist, with the determined object of running down the characters of the princes of the blood, and through them to *destroy the monarchical branch of the constitution*. Having failed in the attempt to injure it by open force, they now proceeded to sap and undermine it by the diffusion of seditious libels, converting the noble attributes of a free press to the most dangerous and detestable purposes. H. r. h. the Commander in Chief was the principal object of their rancorous invective. To his prejudice facts were falsified, and motives attributed to him of which his very nature was incapable. As to the observation of the hon. gent. that the crown lawyers had not done their duty in not prosecuting libellers, he had only to say, that it was not always easy to convict upon an obvious libel, as a very small portion of legal knowledge united with some ingenuity, would be sufficient to defeat a prosecution. When forbearance was stretched to its utmost point, and prosecutions were commenced, the base libellers were found to have absconded. Scarce had the calumny of one of them proceeded from the press, when the calumniator was found to have withdrawn himself to America (*hear! hear!*). The motion of that night put the duke of York and the public in a new situation. It gave the subject a distinct turn, and he knew that that elevated personage would deprecate any proceeding that did not rest upon steps taken in the face of day.

After a few observations from Mr. Wardle, it was resolved that the House should on Wednesday next resolve itself into that Committee.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER then proposed, that the hon. gentleman should give in a list of the names of those witnesses he intended to call to substantiate his charge, that such persons might be summoned to attend at the bar of the House on Wednesday next.

Mr. WARDLE (after having gone to the table to make out his list of witnesses, returned to his seat) and said that he thought it would be attended with no inconvenience to defer mentioning the witnesses till Tuesday, when he should come down to the House prepared to furnish the House with the first part of the case he should proceed to prove, and a list of the witnesses whom it might be necessary to examine relative to that first charge.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Palafox's Dispatch to the Central Junta.*—Dec. 3, 1808.—(continued from page 127.)

It was apprehended that, at this moment, they were proceeding to make an attack, with the whole of their force, in the direction of Casa Blanca; and such was the opinion of the troops stationed at that point, who, more cool and steady than even during any other part of the day, kept up their fire in the olive plantation through which the enemy were retreating, being, at the same time, on their guard lest it should prove a false retreat. But at four o'clock in the afternoon, the enemy filed off in the direction of Alagon, precipitately quitting the field of battle, and leaving behind a considerable quantity of provisions, some baggage, a number of musket locks, and various other articles of military stores. They sustained a considerable loss of men. On our side, we had only one killed, and a few wounded. All the troops and officers conducted themselves with gallantry and soldier-like intrepidity; and particularly general Don Felipe de Saint March, who upon this occasion displayed his military talents, and his characteristic judgment in the dispositions which he made to ensure the success of the action. The peasantry generously offered him their services, and are entitled to the highest praise, for the gallantry with which they saved themselves from a corps of cavalry that had surrounded them, killing one of the enemy's horse, and cutting their way through their troops. The division that was advancing by Zuera retreated before dark towards Tauste, where they arrived at dusk yesterday evening, traversing several rugged mountains and marching nine leagues in the course of the night and day. It is known that another division, of from eight to ten thousand men, who were, doubtless, coming to reinforce the army that attacked this city, passed yesterday through Alsamen, and are to join it on the other side of Alagon. This is all that I can at present communicate to your majesty.

*Palafox's Proclamation to the Arragonese.*—  
Dec. 3, 1808.

THE country demands great sacrifices. She calls us to her assistance; she sees no other defenders but her children; we are her only support. We should violate our duty to her, and to ourselves, did we not

employ our arms and risk our lives and property, in order to save her. Noble Arragonese! brave soldiers! ever ready to shed your blood to defend her and your King, it is unnecessary for me to remind you of sacred duties which you have never forgotten, but the important charge which you have confided to me, and my anxious desires to fulfil my duty, and to make a just return to your attachment, do not permit me to leave unemployed any means that may contribute to deliver you from those perfidious wretches who, already setting themselves in opposition to our determinations, already indifferent to the grand cause which we are defending, give utterance to sentiments little conformable to our tried loyalty. I therefore ordain and command:—1. That all the inhabitants of this city, of every rank and condition, shall consider themselves bound to devote to its defence their persons, property, and lives: the rich and great lending a helping hand to the poor, fostering, and assisting them, contributing to cover their nakedness, and to enable them to maintain their respective posts; thus performing a sacred duty, enjoined by natural affection, and recommended by the holy religion which we profess; and, at the same time, remunerating them for the zeal with which they defend their lives, their estates, and their common country. Should any man be so unnatural as to disown their obligation, he shall be fined in proportion to the magnitude of his offence, and the amount of the fine shall be appropriated to the subsistence of the army.—

(To be continued.)

---

COBBETT'S  
COMPLETE COLLECTION OF

State Trials:

To be completed in Thirty-Six Monthly Parts, forming Twelve large Volumes in Royal Octavo.

The THIRD PART of the above Work will be published on Wednesday, the first of March. One Part will appear, with the greatest regularity, on the first of each succeeding Month. Those Subscribers who have expressed their intention of taking the Work in Quarterly Volumes, are respectfully informed that the First Volume will be ready for delivery on the same day.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 8.] LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1809. [Price 10d.

ANNE, BARONESS GRENVILLE, wife of Lord Grenville, has, for life, a Pension of 1,500 pounds a year, to commence from the Death of Lord Grenville.

LADY LOUISA PAGET, a daughter of the Earl of Uxbridge, has now a Pension of 300 pounds a year, which pension she has had, since the year 1801.

THE MARCHIONESS OF STAFFORD had, until January 1807, a Pension of 300 pounds a year. Whether it has since been resigned does not appear.

CHARLES ABBOT, Esq. Speaker of the House of Commons, besides his salary and house, as Speaker, the salary being 6,000 pounds a year, holds the sinecure place of Keeper of the Signet in Ireland, the annual value of which place is 1,500 pounds a year, and which place he has for life.

In the Account of Places and Pensions, laid before Parliament in June last, it is stated, that, in the year ending on the 8th of April, 1808, the sum of 4,271 pounds was paid to Servants of the late Queen Caroline, and the late *Princess of Wales*; that is to say, to Servants of the present King's Grandmother and Mother. In this sum is included 18*l.* 3*s.* 8*d.* annually paid, even last year, to an alms-house in Hanover.

The same Account exhibits a charge of 200 pounds a year, paid to Ministers at Amsterdam and Rotterdam, and this is stated as actually paid up to 5th January, 1807, without any notification that the payment is to be discontinued.

"Let those think now, who never thought before,  
"And those who always thought, now think the more."

POPE.

257]

[258]

## DUKE OF YORK.

(Continued from page 252.)

IN my last, I stated very fully the reasons why the people should, as to public matters, fix their attention solely upon what was going on in the House of Commons; and, I endeavoured to point out to them the way, in which they ought to apply the facts that came to light; the way, in which they ought to trace the corruptions to the injury of themselves and families.—It now becomes necessary to give an Analysis of the Examinations which have been published; for, though they have all been read, with great avidity, in the daily papers, which papers have discovered, upon this occasion, wonderful capacity, and a very laudable zeal for affording that "*publicity*," which appeared to be so anxiously desired by the friends of the Duke of York; though the examinations have all been read, in that shape, day after day, the interesting facts contained in them must, in the mind of every reader, as they do in mine, lie in a confused state; because, it has necessarily happened, that the cases have not been kept distinct; evidence relating to one case has been brought out during the examination into another case; the cases have, in fact, run into one another, like the branches of plants too luxuriant for their space. To separate them, therefore, to draw to the stem of each its own branches, so that every individual case may stand clearly exposed to the view

and inspection of the public, seems to me to be likely greatly to further the cause of truth; and, indeed, to be absolutely necessary to the forming of a right conclusion.—Considering the mass of Evidence that lies before me, I am not unaware of the arduousness of this task, to be performed by one person, in a space of time necessarily so short; but, there are few things of this sort that any man of common capacity cannot accomplish, if he set resolutely about it; and, at any rate, seeing how large a portion of the public attention I have, for so long a time, enjoyed, it is a duty which I owe that public to make the attempt.—It is necessary further to premise, that this analysis will extend no further than the examinations of Friday, the 17th instant, inclusive, that being the period to which I am in possession of the Evidence. It is possible, that, at a later date, fresh examinations may take place, touching cases, whereon it now appears the evidence is closed. If that should happen, and if any new facts, at all material, should transpire, I shall hereafter notice them, making at the same time, reference to the case, or cases, upon which they bear.—No desire was ever more clearly, or more strongly expressed, than the desire on the part of the Duke of York, that *publicity* should be given to all these proceedings; and, so entirely do I agree in that wish, that, before I have done with the subject, my intention is, not only to communicate every fact of importance

to the public, but also, to furnish a *Table of Contents*, and a complete *Index*, to the whole; so that, with the least possible difficulty, the reader may, at any moment, refer to any part, whether of the Evidence, the Debates, or the Comments. This is not a matter that ought to pass away like a summer's cloud; it is not, and it ought not to be, the subject of a nine day's wonder; it is an event, which, sooner or later, must lead to great consequences; it will, in short, form an epoch in the History of this nation; therefore, it ought to be put upon record with fidelity and clearness, in every publication wherein the mention of it shall find a place, and especially in a work professing to be a Political Register.

—As to the manner of the Analysis, upon which I am about to enter, I shall endeavour to follow, as nearly as I am able, the example of an impartial judge, when he is what is commonly called *summing up the evidence upon a trial*; and, if I do strictly adhere to this most excellent example, neither party can possibly have reason to complain.—I shall not confine myself to such cases as are merely of a *military* nature; for, though Mr. Wardle's Charges were so confined, other matters have come out, and, in all, the people are interested full as deeply as if they were matters solely connected with the office of the Commander in Chief. The first head, therefore, under which I shall enter upon this Analysis, is that of

#### THE ADULTROUS INTERCOURSE.

The existence of this Intercourse has not been attempted to be denied. Indeed, the whole proceeding is founded on the admission of it. But, though those who have taken the part of the Duke of York; though both sides of the House of Commons seem to give up his moral character, as far, at least, as relates to his conjugal obligations, it will be right for us to draw to a point those parts of the Evidence, which establish the fact of this Adultrous Intercourse.—First, then, *Mrs. Clarke* states, that she lived in the house in Gloucester Place, *under the protection* of the Duke of York; that he took the house in order to keep her there; that he made her a pecuniary annual allowance; that he bought her furniture and jewels; that he eat, drank, and lived with her.—The Duke's own servant, *Ludorick*, states, that he was the person who attended his master at Mrs. Clarke's; that his master was frequently there, and that it was part of his employment to carry his master's clothes

in the morning.—Three servants of Mrs. Clarke state, that they saw the Duke there constantly; that they saw him at table with their mistress; and, at last comes *Mrs. Favourite*, Mrs. Clarke's house-keeper, who, in speaking of one particular transaction, states that she saw the Duke and Mrs. Clarke *in bed* together.—*Mr. Adam* states, that Mrs. Clarke was under the protection of the Duke; that a separation took place upon his advice; and that upon this separation, he (*Mr. Adam*) was, upon that occasion authorized by the Duke, to tell her that he thought it his duty to give her an annuity of £.400 a year, provided her conduct should be correct.—Lastly, we have the written evidence of *the Duke himself*, who in the following two Letters, addressed to Mrs. Clarke, and which Letters have been proved to be in his handwriting, enables us to form an unerring judgment as to the nature of the connection which existed between him and Mrs. Clarke.—

“ August 4, 1805.—How can I sufficiently express to My Sweetest, My Darling Love, the delight which her dear, her pretty letter gave me, or how much I feel all the kind things she says to me in it? Millions and millions of thanks for it, My Angel! and Be assured that my heart is fully sensible of your affection, and that upon it alone its whole happiness depends.—I am, however, quite hurt that My Love did not go to the Lewes Races; how kind of her to think of me upon the occasion; but I trust that she knows me too well not to be convinced that I cannot bear the idea of adding to those sacrifices which I am but too sensible that she has made to me.—News, My Angel cannot expect from me from hence; though the life led here, at least in the family I am in, is very hurrying, there is a sameness in it which affords little subject for a letter; except Lord Cheshire's family, there is not a single person except ourselves that I know. Last night we were at the Play, which went off better than the first night.—Dr. O'Meara called upon me yesterday morning, and delivered me your letter; he wishes much to preach before Royalty, and if I can put him in the way of it I will.—What a time it appears to me already, My Darling, since we parted; how impatiently I look forward to next Wednesday se'nnight!—God bless you, my own Dear, Dear Love! I shall miss

" the Post if I add more ; Oh believe me  
" ever, to my last hour, Your's and Your's  
" alone."

Addressed : " Mrs. Clarke, to be left  
" at the Post-office, Worthing."

" Sandgate, Aug. 24, 1804.—How can  
" I sufficiently express to My Darling  
" Love my thanks for her dear, dear let-  
" ter, or the delight which the assurances  
" of her love give me ? Oh, My Angel !  
" do me justice and be convinced that  
" there never was a Woman adored as  
" you are. Every day, every hour con-  
" vinces me more and more, that my  
" whole happiness depends upon you alone.  
" What a time it appears to be since we  
" parted, and with what impatience do I  
" look forward to the day after to-morrow ;  
" there are still however two whole Nights  
" before I shall clasp My Darling in my  
" arms !—How happy am I to learn that  
" you are better ; I still however will not  
" give up my hopes of the cause of your  
" feeling uncomfortable. Clavering is  
" mistaken, My Angel, in thinking that  
" any new regiments are to be raised ; it  
" is not intended, only second Battalions  
" to the existing Corps ; you had better,  
" therefore, tell him so, and that you were  
" sure that there would be no use in apply-  
" ing for him.—Ten thousand thanks, My  
" Love, for the handkerchiefs, which are  
" delightful ; and I need not, I trust, as-  
" sure you of the pleasure I feel in wear-  
" ing them, and thinking of the dear hands  
" who made them for me.—Nothing could  
" be more satisfactory than the tour I  
" have made, and the state in which I  
" have found every thing. The whole of  
" the day before yesterday was employed  
" in visiting the Works at Dover ; review-  
" ing the Troops there, and examining  
" the Coast as far as this place. From  
" Folkestone I had a very good view of those  
" of the French Camp.—Yesterday I first  
" reviewed the Camp here, and afterwards  
" the 14th Light Dragoons, who are cer-  
" tainly in very fine order ; and from  
" thence proceeded to Brabourne Lees, to  
" see four regiments of Militia ; which,  
" altogether, took me up near 13 hours.  
" I am now setting off immediately to  
" ride along the coast to Hastings, review-  
" ing the different Corps as I pass, which  
" will take me at least as long. Adieu,  
" therefore, My Sweetest, Dearest Love,  
" till the day after to-morrow, and be as-  
" sured that to my last hour I shall ever  
" remain Yours and Yours alone."

Addressed, " George Farquhar, Esq. No.  
" 18, Gloucester-place, Portman-square."

—All that it is necessary to add to this  
evidence is, a statement of the well known  
facts, that the *Duchess of York* is living,  
that she is in England, and that there  
never has been any legal separation be-  
tween her and her husband.

### THE ANNUITY.

Contracts, with whomsoever made, are  
binding upon the parties. To break a  
promise is a breach of moral duty ; and,  
therefore, it becomes us to ascertain,  
as nearly as we can, the truth, with respect  
to the Annuity, which Mrs. Clarke was to  
receive, as the cast-off concubine of the  
Duke of York.—She herself has stated,  
that Mr. Adam, in the name of the Duke,  
promised her an Annuity of £.400 a year.  
In one instance she says, that Mr. Adam  
*guaranteed* the payment of this annuity.  
She complains, that for more than a year  
and a half it has not been paid ; and,  
upon this non-payment we see that she  
grounds all her disclosures against the  
Duke of York. She states, besides, that  
she was left, upwards of two thousand  
pounds in debt to divers trades-people ;  
and that, having since sent a remonstrance  
to the Duke upon the subject, the Duke  
insisted that she should *plead her marriage*  
*to avoid her debts*, or that she might, if she  
liked, go to prison. She further states,  
that having sent the Duke a letter, not  
long since, by one Taylor, a shoe-maker in  
Bond Street, requesting a few hundred  
pounds, he sent for answer, by the mouth  
of this same Taylor, that if she dared  
speak against him, or write against him,  
he would put her in the *pillory* or the *Bastile*.  
The reader will bear in mind, that  
this fact rests *solely* upon Mrs. Clarke's  
evidence ; but he will also bear in mind,  
that, if false, it *might have been easily disproved* by Taylor, the bearer of the  
message, and that Taylor *was not called to disprove it* ; and he will further bear in mind,  
that this threat, if he should conclude that  
it actually was made, was made against  
that very person, to whom the Duke had  
written the *two letters* above inserted.—  
But now, as to whether the annuity was  
actually promised, or, if upon *conditions*,  
whether the breach of those conditions  
justified the non-performance of the promise.—Mr. Adam's words, as to the  
promise, are these : " I told her, that the  
" Duke of York thought it his *duty*, if her  
" conduct was *correct*, to give her an annui-  
" ty of £.400 a year, to be paid quarterly ;  
" that he would enter into no obligation in  
" writing, by bond or otherwise ; that it

"must rest entirely upon his word, to be performed, or not, according to her behaviour." — Her statement is, that £500 arrears of the annuity were due *in June last*.—There seems to be no doubt of the promise having been *made*, and that, after a little while at first, it *has not been fulfilled*. It, therefore, remains for us to inquire, what were the *conditions*, if any, and whether these conditions have been observed by Mrs. Clarke.—The only condition stated by Mr. Adam to have been made by him, in the name of the Duke, was, that "her conduct should be *correct*." This, if it can be called a condition, was, especially as coming from the lips of a lawyer, very vaguely expressed. The word *correct* as applied to the conduct of a person, can hardly be said to have a meaning, and, when applied to the *general conduct* of a person, has absolutely no meaning at all. In short, as used in this case, it is one of those convenient terms, that admit of *any construction*; that may be made to mean whatever the person using it chooses it should mean; that may be twisted and turned to any purpose for which it may be wanted.—The reader, therefore, leaving Mr. Adam's connection with the Duke out of the question, and leaving out of the question also Mr. Adam's general character, will ask himself, whether the internal evidence of the case would lead him to think that a person like Mrs. Clarke, would, even for a moment, have been satisfied with any promise, to which *such a condition* was attached?—But, next, *in what way* has Mrs. Clarke broken the contract? This has no where been shewn. Indeed, no attempt has been made to prove that she has violated the contract. We have no occasion to ask what was meant by the word *correct*, because no *proof* has been produced, that there was any justifiable cause for the non-fulfilment of the promise. Mr. Adam says, in explanation of the meaning of this term, that, what he meant by it was, that she should not any longer *contract debts by making use of the Duke's name*; and, no evidence has been produced, that she has done so.—That Mrs. Clarke understood, that she was to be paid £100 a year quarterly, is evident enough; her complaints, made in letters to Mr. Adam himself, are strong presumptive proof of this; and, it is here to be observed, that Mr. Adam made no answer to these letters; that he did not repeat the accusation against the Duke of having broken his promise; and that, in stating

that he shewed these letters to the Duke, he does not say, that any observation was made by the Duke as to the truth or falsehood of the contents of the letters. He merely says, that the Duke expressed no apprehension at the *threats*; but, does not say, that he expressed any indignation at the falsehood of the charge of having broken his promise; which, however, if the charge had been false, it was very natural for him to do, and particularly to Mr. Adam, who had been his agent in this negociation with his concubine, and through whose lips the promise of the annuity had been made.—Upon the whole of this case, then, it is clear, that the promise *was made*, and that it *has not been fulfilled*; and, the question for the reader to settle in his mind is this: whether the non-fulfilment arose from a conscientious conviction, in the mind of the Duke of York, that Mrs. Clarke had violated her part of the compact; or, from a persuasion, in his mind, that his well-known power, joined to his positive threats of the *pillory* or the *Bastile*, would enable him, with impunity, to withhold the means of living from a female, on whose breast he had, for years, rioted in bliss, and to whom, but a few months before, he had vowed everlasting affection.—If the former, the decision must be, that, in this respect, the Duke is not intentionally to blame; if the latter, that he is the most unfeeling as well as the most mean of mankind.

#### ESTABLISHMENT IN GLOUCESTER PLACE.

The *expences* of this establishment form a very prominent and a very important branch of the inquiries, upon the sum of which, we are now endeavouring to arrive at a correct opinion; because, from a view of these expences as compared with the pecuniary allowance, immediately out of the pocket of the Duke, an inference must be drawn as to the Duke's knowing whether, or not, money must have been raised by Mrs. Clarke from sources other than his private purse.—The establishment, from the evidence of several servants, who formed part of it, appears to have consisted of a house-keeper and from three to four other females; of a butler, and, at the lowest, six other men servants; of eight horses and of two carriages. It appears, from the same concurrent testimony, that a continual round of company was kept in Gloucester Place; that a great deal of wine was drunk; and that there were frequently employed two, and

sometimes three, men-cooks. It appears, that concerts were frequent, or, at least, musical parties; that music-masters, singing boys, drawing masters, were frequently there, and that, in short, every thing was carried on in a style the most expensive that can be imagined.—Mrs. Clarke herself states, that the servants bare wages and their *liveries* cost her, at least, £1,000 a-year. She says, that the Duke paid for some of her horses, but that, in one year, she laid out £900 in horses only.—The allowance, made to her by the Duke, for the support of this establishment, she states at £1,000 a year, which sum, she says, she soon convinced the Duke, was hardly sufficient to defray the expences of servants wages, and of their liveries. Upon further examination, she says, that the £1,000 a year was always very irregularly paid; that, sometimes, when she has been hard pressed by the trades-people, she has got a hundred or two pounds from the Duke; but after much examination and cross-examination, she has, to the last, persisted in averring, that the whole which she got from the Duke, did not exceed in amount from £1,200 to £1,500 a-year. She says, that she got divers presents, in trinkets and jewels, from the Duke; but that these were frequently *in pawn*, to the knowledge of the Duke, whose draft the pawn-broker refused to take as a surety on a proposition for their emancipation. She allows that the Duke furnished the house in Gloucester Place, generally, at the outset; but that she herself paid for the glasses, which cost her £500. She was allowed a house at Weybridge by the Duke; and she says, that, out of her own purse, she paid from 3 to £100 for the repair and enlargement of the house and its buildings. She allows that the Duke paid her £500 at the outset, exclusive of the £1,000 a year. She allows, that the Duke sent a large quantity of Port wine to Gloucester Place; but says, that she bought and paid for the Madeira and Claret, a great deal of which was drunk in the house. She states, and the fact appears not to have been questioned, that, when the Duke left her, she was, at least, £2,000 in debt, debts contracted by her, while she was in his keeping, and that this sum was exclusive of the amount of the lease of the house (£1,400) which the Duke gave her, and which she transferred to her lawyer in part payment of debts due to him. She says, that she has heard that the Duke should say, that she might sell her trinkets to pay the remainder of her debts, but

she states that he knows very well what became of them.—Being questioned as to the circumstances of her pecuniary embarrassments, while in Gloucester Place, she says, that when the trades-people could not get money from her, they pressed for *places*; and that, though they renewed their pressing for money, when they could not get places, they were always well pleased to trust her, because, in the end, they were sure to make her pay handsomely for it—Being questioned as to the time when she began to be pressed for money, her answer is: “About half a year after my connection with his Royal Highness began. I never applied to him; till I found myself distressed; and, then he told me, that I had *more interest than the Queen*, and that I should use it.” Being asked: “Was the Duke acquainted with ‘any of your transactions, respecting the disposal of commissions, &c.’” Her answer is: “With the whole of them.”—The reader, after having made an estimate of the expences of an establishment, or rather, double establishment (including town and country) like that above described; after duly weighing in his mind the effect of charges made upon calculations of such manifest risk as well from final preable loss as from almost certain long delay; after having well considered all the consequences of the observations of servants, respecting the manner in which their mistress got her money, as well as the consequences of a total want of check or controul, whether as to quantity, quality, price, or disposal; after thus estimating and thus considering, the reader will be the better prepared for hearing the matter which Mr. Perceval brought forward, upon this part of the subject, on Friday, the 17th instant, and which, according to the fullest report that I can find of his speech, was stated in the following words.—“The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER before proceeding to the letters brought up by the select committee, said, he had a few observations to offer in answer to a question which had been put to him a few nights since by an hon. gentleman under the gallery (Mr. Cripps), with respect to the amount of the expence furnished by the Duke of York, for the establishment in Gloucester-place.—As far as he could obtain information, no accurate account of that expenditure could be got; but so far as he had been able to procure any items, he would now inform the House.—By the draughts in the house of the Duke of York’s banker, it appeared that £5,551

"had been paid to the person who was "always employed by his royal highness, "to receive the money intended for Mrs. Clarke. Beyond that (*as his Royal Highness authorised him to sue to the Committee*) his royal highness frequently gave "her personally other and considerable sums, of which, however, he had kept "no memorandum. Mrs. Clarke had "stated at the bar, that her allowance of "£. 1000 per annum, was paid in drafts. "With regard to those drafts from the "banker, if the house thought it necessary "to have any proof, they might examine "the servant, to whom they were uniformly paid at the banker's. This servant then took the money to the Duke, "who put it under a cover, sealed it, and "sent it by the same person to Mrs. Clarke. Besides this, there were tradesmen for furniture, wine, jewels, and the plate (with which the house was already acquainted) to make the total amount of £. 16,760 from Jan. 1804 to May 1806. Here the right hon. gentleman, "if it was necessary, might be called to "prove the facts he now stated, *on the authority of his royal highness*, at the bar of "the house."—Reader; impartial reader, does not this strike you as a very novel procedure? However Mr. Perceval, who came into office to protect "our holy religion," may console himself with a statement of the Duke of York having expended £. 16,760 upon a concubine, while, in addition to all his immense salaries and pensions, he was borrowing £. 54,000 from the minister out of the taxes raised upon us; however *consoling* this may be to Mr. Perceval, does it not strike you, that the producing as evidence, facts stated upon the authority of the party accused, is something new, quite new, in English jurisprudence? Have you ever seen, or heard, of any thing like this before, either in parliament, or in any court of justice? Is this the way in which any of us are treated, when we are tried? If there happen to be more than one judge upon the bench, do we ever see any of them pulling papers out of his pocket, and, in contradiction to evidence given before the court, state so and so, upon the authority of the person under trial?—But, reader, why was this statement kept in petto, till the last moment? Why was not the bare word (for it is no more) of the Duke taken before, and opposed to the declarations of every witness, in every stage of the proceeding?—In short, why all this time taken up in inquiry? Why not have asked the Duke, at

the beginning, whether there was any truth in Mr. Wardle's charges, or not; and why not have produced a short note from him to satisfy us all, that the thing was false from beginning to end?—Nevertheless, the report (in the Courier news-paper of the 18th instant) says, that Mr. Canning said, that the "Chancellor of the Exchequer," Mr. Perceval, "was enabled to prove, on the most unquestionable authority, that the Duke had furnished Mrs. Clarke with the £. 16,760." So that, after all this work, the Duke's word is the best authority!—Mr. Fuller is reported to have spoken thus:—"What would the house, or the public, wish for more, than that £ 16,000 should be spent in two years on such a baggage as this. For his part he thought it might have been seen from the shuffling way in which she answered the first six questions put to her, that they ought not to have proceeded with this silly and foolish inquiry."—In the last part of his observations Mr. Fuller was right enough, if the Duke's word is to be opposed to the evidence against him. Not only not more than six questions; but no question at all should have been put to Mrs. Clarke, if the Duke's word is to be opposed to her evidence.—Mr. Beresford, however, is reported to have observed, upon this very novel procedure, that "it was needless to think, that, by shutting their own eyes, the House could also shut the eyes of the public;" and never did he make a truer observation in his life.—Mr. Perceval was then examined thus: "Question:—Do you know if his Royal Highness paid any, and what sums, towards keeping the house in Gloucester-place, besides £. 1,000 a year allowed to Mrs. Clarke?—Answer:—I know nothing of the £. 1,000 a year but from the witness at the bar. From the Paper I now hold in my hand, I see, that from the 11th of January, 1804, to the 18th of June, 1806, £. 5,551 has been paid in drafts (*as the certificate of the Duke of York at the bottom states*) for the use of Mrs. Clarke. The payments to the tradesmen are also verified by the certificate, and to the best of my recollection and belief."—Lord Folkestone objected to this *hear-say* evidence in favour of the accused, when it had uniformly been rejected, if attempted to be used against him.—They now desisted; and they still left it, as the reader will receive it, the bare word of the Duke of York against the evidence of Mrs. Clarke, corroborated by the magnitude of the es-

tablishments in Gloucester Place and at Weybridge.—Mr. Cripps, however, whose question appears as *naturally as can be*, to have produced that “*diligent inquiry*” from Mr. Perceval that led to this curious procedure, was, it appears from the report of his speech, wonderfully well satisfied with the account of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.—“Mr. Cripps thanked the right hon. gentleman for the information he had given him. He would not have made the enquiry till the end of the previous investigation, had he not been aware that very strong impressions had been made on the public mind, from the belief that Mrs. Clarke was supposed to support her expensive establishment on the allowance of £. 3,000 for three years.” The answer was most satisfactory, and what ever might be the issue of this enquiry, “it must be a great consolation to his Royal Highness to know, that without it, it never would have been known to the public in the manner unfolded by Colonel Gordon, in how excellent and regular a manner every thing was conducted in the Office of the Commander in Chief, so highly to his honour, and so productive of benefit to the British army.”—Aye, aye, Sir! It was not necessary for you to state, that you were fully aware of the strong impression made on the public mind by Mrs. Clarke’s evidence, though, if I forget not, some one or more did say, that she shuffled in such a manner, that no one could possibly believe a word that she said. We can have no doubt, Sir, that you are satisfied, because you say so; but, it does not follow, that we should be satisfied by so easy a method.—And why, Sir, digress? why fly off from this soul-comforting statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and draw us after you, into observations upon the “excellent and regular manner,” in which Col. Gordon shows “every thing is conducted in the Office of the Commander in Chief?” What has he shewn, Sir? That the dates of recommendations and of appointments and commissions are regularly entered, and that letters are neatly copied into books? Why, Sir, we know, that this office costs us, including the salaries and pensions of the Duke, *hundreds of thousands a year*; aye, hundreds of thousands; and, there is nothing there done, as far as appears from the evidence given to the House, that might not be done, and *full as well too*, by any four or five of the five hundred persons, who, by an advertisement in the news-papers, offering them £.150 a year a-piece, would be induced

to offer their services before next Saturday night. This is my sincere opinion, and, if it can be shown to be erroneous, let it be done.—But, be this as it may; what has the regular keeping of books in the Duke’s office to do with Mrs. Clarke’s sale of commissions? what has it to do with the establishment and the vile traffic in Gloucester Place? This “regularity” did not prevent the offering of Samuel Carter, the concubine’s foot-boy, as we shall see anon. Oh! this will never do. This is poor work. If Col. Gordon can bring proof, from his books or his boxes that all that has been proved has not been proved; why, then, this able Colonel may be said to have afforded “great consolation” to his royal employer; but, if he cannot do that, it is even to undervalue the sense of the Duke to suppose, that, from what the Colonel has done, or can do, he will derive any consolation.—Before we return to our case, a remark or two is, by this digression, justified, and even called for, with respect to the evidence of all the military officers, and indeed, almost all the witnesses that have been called.—In courts of justice, the evidence of a brother, a father, or a very close friend, is always received with some portion of allowance for partiality. Persons, known to be in any-wise dependant upon the parties, are heard and believed with similar caution. There is no doubt, that my neighbour, or a stranger, is a better evidence for me than my own servant. The officers of the army are not the servants of the Duke of York; but, it is perfectly well known, that they are much more dependant upon him than any servant, considered merely as such, can possibly be upon any master. The worst I can do to a servant is to turn him off; but, the Commander in Chief can, with the approbation of the king, at any moment, without reason assigned, not only turn any officer off, but, by that very act, strip him of his rank in life, and of the means of obtaining even bread to eat. My discarded servant can go to another master; but, there is no other master, no other service for the cashiered officer to go to. For this reason, amongst others, it doubtless was, that sir Francis Burdett wished it to be enacted, that no officer should be discarded without being so sentenced by a court martial; a law the more necessary, because the office of Commander in Chief was held by a son of the king, by which means the advice as well as the power was concentrated in the throne.—I say not this with any wish to disparage the evidence of Colonels Gordon and Lo-

raine, or of any other of the military officers; but, I say it, with a view to shew to the public, that their evidence is not all to be taken for Gospel, merely on account of the rank they hold. Mr. French is a Colonel, and Mr. Clavering is a General. —Let it be remembered too, in answer to what has been said about taking the Duke and his friends by surprize, that Mrs. Clarke's letters to Mr. Adam have been in his possession from June last. They were there apprized of her intended exposure. So that they have had six times as much time as Mr. Wardle, who became acquainted with the facts but a month before he brought forward his charges.—Having thus, cleared all the cases together of these unfair impressions scattered about amongst them, we will now return to that immediately under consideration.—The reader has had a view of the magnitude of the establishments in Gloucester place and at Weybridge; he is pretty well able to judge of their annual expences; he has Mrs. Clarke's evidence that she never got, from the pocket of the Duke, more than £. 1,200, or at most, more than £. 1,500, a year wherewith to defray those expences, when £. 1,000 a year was scarcely enough to pay wages and purchase liverys; he has her evidence, that the Duke, when she complained of her pecuniary embarrassments, told her *she had greater INTEREST than the Queen, and that she ought to use it*; and, he has, in the Duke's own hand writing, the *proof*, that she did interfere in promotions, and that he spoke to her of such things, as of things of course, witness the cases of General Clavering and Dr. O' Meara. Opposed to all this there is not one particle of evidence good or bad, unless the Duke's bare word; unless the bare word of the accused, be admitted as evidence. If however, the reader thinks that bare word sufficient to knock down such a body of evidence, he will, of course, have his doubts about the Duke's knowing that his concubine's establishments were partly supported by bribes given for commissions and the like; but, if the reader should be of a contrary opinion, his conclusion, without going into any of the particular cases of corruption, must be, that the Duke must have been all along fully aware, that the establishments were for the far greater part, supported by those corrupt and wicked means, and of course, that the expences attending his profligate pleasures were, in that same degree, ultimately defrayed out of taxes raised from the fortunes and labour of the people.

#### CASE OF KNIGHT AND BROOKE.

It is alledged, that, in July 1805, Col. or Lt. Col. (no matter which) Knight, wished to make an exchange of commissions with a Major, or a Lt. Col. Brooke; that the application of these two gentlemen had been, for some time, before the Duke of York; that it was not followed by the grant of the Duke to exchange; till, at last, Mr. Robert Knight, brother of Col. Knight, at the suggestion of Dr. Thynne (the medical attendant of Mrs. Clarke), offered to Mrs. Clarke, through Doctor Thynne, the sum of £.200 if she would get the exchange accomplished; that Mrs. Clarke undertook the job; that she told the Duke of York that she was to be paid for it; that the exchange, in a few days afterwards, was ordered to take place and was actually gazetted; that, upon this, the fulfilment of the contract on her part, Mr. Knight paid her the £.200, and that she not only told the Duke, that the money had been paid her, but actually shew him the note or notes.

Dr. Andrew Thynne stated, that at the request of Mr. Knight he made the overture to Mrs. Clarke; that he was authorized to offer her £.200 if she would cause the exchange to be expedited; that he expected her to be able to get the thing done through her influence with a certain great person; that this great person was the Commander in Chief; that, when the exchange was effected, Mrs. Clarke sent to the witness, the Gazette, in which it was recorded, accompanied with a note from herself, saying, that, as she was going to the country, £.200 would be very convenient to her; that, when he made the offer to Mrs. Clarke, he gave her the names of the parties upon a slip of paper; that Mrs. Clarke talked about the necessity of secrecy, but the witness cannot tell from whom she was desirous to keep the thing a secret; that he never saw the Duke of York at Mrs. Clarke's; that he, the witness, understood, from Mr. Knight, that the exchange would be carried through in the regular manner, but Mr. Knight wished, in consequence of the bad health, of his brother, that the business should be expedited, and for that purpose application was made to Mrs. Clarke.

Mr. Robert Knight corroborated Dr. Thynne as to the motive of the application to Mrs. Clarke; he said further, that, when the exchange was effected, he sent Mrs. Clarke the £.200; that his brother had before received, from the office of the

Duke of York, a notification in the usual way, that, when a proper successor presented, there would be no objection to the exchange; that he does not know of any positive promise made to his brother by the Duke, previous to the application to Mrs. Clarke. Upon being asked: "Why was the application made to Mrs. Clarke?" he answered, "There was a delay in the business; but the cause of it I do not know. I mentioned the circumstance to Mr. Thynne, who was then attending my family. He advised me to apply to a good friend of his, Mrs. Clarke." He then repeated what he has said before about the offer of money.—Upon further questioning, he says, that Mrs. Clarke desired him to keep the whole transaction a secret, *lest it should come to the ears of the Duke of York*; and that, recently, she has told him, that the Duke having used her extremely ill, leaving her in debt about £2,000, she would, if she could bring him to no terms, expose him, whereupon the witness said, he hoped she would not expose him and his brother by mentioning their names, to which she answered, that God knew that was not her intention.

*Mrs. Mary Anne Clarke* states, that in, or about, July 1805, Dr. Thynne applied to her to obtain leave for an exchange between Knight and Brooke; that he made her an offer of a pecuniary compliment; that she thinks the sum mentioned was a couple of hundred of pounds; that Dr. Thynne told her, at the time, that Mr. Knight had long been endeavouring to get this leave, but had not yet succeeded; that, on the same day, in which the proposition was made to her, she mentioned it to the Duke of York, and gave him, while at dinner, the slip of paper, which she had received from Dr. Thynne, containing the names of the parties; that the Duke asked her whether she knew the parties; that she answered that she did not know them at all, and that certainly they would make some sort of compliment, but that she is not certain that she mentioned the exact amount of the compliment; that, when the exchange appeared in the Gazette, she sent the Gazette to Dr. Thynne, together with a note from herself; that, in a day or two after that, she received the £. 200, which came to her in a note, with Dr. Thynne's compliments; that she thinks the compliments were written in the note; that she made this circumstance of the receipt of the money known to the Duke of York; that she did this on the day on

which she received the money; that the Duke must have known the amount of the note, because she shewed it him, and she thinks that she got one of his servants to get it exchanged for her, through his Royal Highness.—Upon her cross-examination, she says, that she thinks she can say positively that the note, with the money in it, came from Dr. Thynne, because she told her maid to go down and give the man who brought it a guinea; that the Duke got the note changed for her, because she could not get it done herself; that she did not know any thing of the servant's name who was sent to get the note changed.—Being asked, whether she desired Mr. Knight to keep the matter *secret*, she says, she should think that she did certainly, but does not recollect, but it is very likely she did. Being asked, whether she ever expressed a wish that it should be kept a secret from the Duke; she says, "O no, never;" and that she is quite positive that she never said any thing like it. Being asked, what the Duke said, when she first opened the business to him and told him she was to receive a compliment; she says: "He told me that he knew the business very well, that they had been trying at it some time, and that he thought one of them was rather a bad subject; but he would do it." Being asked what time of the year the transaction took place, she says: "The Duke was going down to Weymouth on the night that I changed the note, which was the reason that I got the note changed; my servants could not get it changed, and his servant got it changed for me. Lord Chesterfield's family was going down, and he was going to be god-father to Lord Chesterfield's child: it was the end of July or the beginning of August."

*Colonel Gordon*, who is the public military Secretary of the Duke of York, says, in substance, this: that it is his duty to make to the Duke a report upon all applications for promotions, or exchanges; that he has no doubt that he made an enquiry upon the case of Knight and Brooke; that he fully believes, that the grant of the exchange was made in consequence of his report; that he kept no minute of the enquiry or report, and was not in the habit of doing so; that the delay in question took place on account of some doubts of the eligibility of Col. Brooke, and not on account of any objection to Col. Knight's request; that he has not the smallest reason to suspect that any influence other

than that of the general rules of the service produced the grant of leave to exchange; that the Duke's approbation was given on the 23rd of July, 1805, that the King's signature was affixed to it on the 24th, and that the exchange was gazetted on the 30th.—In the course of his examination he produced an answer of his to a letter from Col. Knight (which answer was dated 21 June, 1805), requesting leave

to exchange, the answer stating that the Duke had no objection to the exchange, and that, when an *eligible successor could be recommended*, the request would be taken into consideration.—Col. Gordon also produced the following document contained in a letter from Greenwood and Cox, the agents of some of the parties, which document bears date, 1 July, 1805.

## BROOKE'S SERVICES.

Comet, 8 Dns. - - -	29 June	93
Lieut. 83 F. - - -	7 Oct.	93
Capt. Ind. Co. - - -	14 Dec.	93
— 96 - - -	25 Mar.	94
Maj. - - - -	13 Dec.	94
Placed on half-pay -	Mar.	98
Bt. Lt. Colonel - - -	1 Jan. 1800	By direction of General Norton, we have the honour to inclose a form, signed by Brevet Lieut.
Maj. - - 48 - - -	24 May 1804	tenant Colonel Brooke of the 56th regiment, to
Cancelled - - - -	9 June 1804	Maj. - - 56 - - - 5 Jan. 1805 exchange with Brevet Lieutenant Colonel Knight of the 5th Dragoon Guards, together with a copy
—	—	of a letter from Lieutenant Colonel Knight, stating,

23 July, 05.

*H. R. H. does now approve of this exchange.*

## C. L.

*cannot be acceded to, H. R. H. does not approve of the exchange proposed.*

ed the counterpart of the exchange has been sent in through the Agents of the 5th Dragoon Guards, you will be pleased to submit the same to Field Marshal His Royal Highness the Duke of York.—We have the honour to be, Sir, Your most obedient humble Servant, GREENWOOD & COX.

N. B.—Mark well, reader, the words in *Italics*, were, in the original produced, written in PENCIL!!!

*Ludowick Orramin* (who was called on a later day) a footman of the Duke of York, said, that he was a foreigner; that he had lived 18 years with the Duke; *that no other of the Duke's servants ever went to Mrs. Clarke's*; that he used to go there at eight o'clock in the morning to take the Duke's clothes; that he never saw Mrs. Clarke at her house but once, when he went to take a favourite dog for her to see; that the Duke was not then there; *that he is quite certain that he never was sent by any one, from her house, to get any note changed*. In his cross-examination, he repeated these assertions; he said, that no other servant of the Duke was permitted to go to Mrs. Clarke's; he asserted of his own knowledge, that no other of the Duke's servants ever went there. He said he had been asked (*previous to his coming to the House of Commons*) the same question about the note, by the Duke, by Mr. Adam, by Mr. Lowther, and by Mr. Wilkinson, and that he had given them the same answer.

*David Pierson* (who was called on a day

after Orramin had given his evidence) was butler to Mrs. Clarke in 1805, and is now butler to the Honble. Mr. Turner. He states, that he recollects in 1805, the Duke going to Weymouth and Mrs. Clarke to Worthing; that, about that time, which was in hot weather, he saw Mrs. Favourite (Mrs. Clarke's house-keeper) bring down a bill, in the morning, and Ludowick going out and getting it changed, and coming back and giving it to Mrs. Favourite again, and she took it up stairs; that he does not know the amount of the note; that the Duke was up stairs at the time; that he is not certain whether the Duke was up or not; that this is the only note he ever recollects Ludowick's getting changed.—*Pierson*, in a second examination, recollects, what he had forgotten before, that, on the night that the Duke of York went to Weymouth, about 11 o'clock at night, he himself was sent out to get a bill changed; that he went out and got it changed; that he brought the change to Mrs. Clarke, who said it was all right;

that the Duke of York was present both when he got the bill from his mistress and when he brought the change, that he got the bill changed at Byfield Bridgeman's; and that, to the best of his recollection, it was a bill of £. 100.

*Mr. Bridgeman* states, that he recollects Pierson's bringing a note to be changed, about July 1805, and that Pierson said it was a note of £.100, but that the note was not changed.

*Mrs. Favourite*, the house-keeper of Mrs. Clarke, is asked: "Did you ever give 'Ludwick a note to get changed?" Her answer is this: "I did; but I cannot say "what was the amount of the note. I "gave it him, he went out and brought "me the change. I brought up the change "to the bed-chamber, where his royal "highness and Mrs. Clarke were. In short "they were in bed."

Such is the evidence upon this case, and now let us see what it amounts to; let us examine into the quality of the separate parts; see how those parts correspond with each other; and how far the criminal evidence is contradicted by the exculpatory.—*FIRST* (repeating, for a little, some former observations of mine,) it is proved, that Dr. Thynne, who had, for several years, attended in the house of Mrs. Clarke, pointed out to Mr. Knight an application to her as the effectual and speedy way of obtaining the Duke of York's approbation of an exchange between two field officers of the army, which exchange had already been applied for in the regular way, and had, as yet, at least, not been obtained: *SECOND*, it is proved, that Dr. Thynne did make the application to Mrs. Clarke, and that he promised her £.200, in case the exchange should take place: *THIRD*, it is proved, that the exchange did, in a few days afterwards, take place: *FOURTH*, it is proved, that Mrs. Clarke, in consequence of the exchange having taken place, did receive from Mr. Knight the said sum of £.200. All this is proved without any of the testimony of Mrs. Clarke. Mrs. Clarke, if the Duke had a knowledge of the bargain, must be looked upon as an accomplice; and, accomplices are not usually allowed to be sufficient witnesses to produce legal conviction; but, when their evidence is corroborated by strong circumstances, and especially, when, as in this case, they are in no danger themselves, such evidence is invariably taken to be good. She states, that she immediately applied to the Duke; that he said one of the parties was a bad subject,

but that the thing should be done; and she further states, that when she had received the £.200, she told the Duke of it, and, in his presence, sent the note to be changed by one of his own servants, whose name she does not recollect. If we believe her here, the case is complete. But, we must now take a view of the opposing evidence, beginning with what has been said as to her general character. *Mr. Adam* represents her as a woman, who, upon former occasions, had told contradictory stories, and, in particular, relating to her being a widow and to the place of her marriage. She had, it is asserted, stated herself to be a widow, had contracted debts under that character, and had afterwards, in a court of justice, got rid of the debts by pleading her marriage. Through the whole of the evidence there is no proof of her having herself represented that she was a widow, except in the case of a court-martial, where she had been called as a witness, and of this she gives the following explanation. Being asked: "Have you not sworn yourself to be a widow?"—She answers: "His Royal Highness, a very short time since, when I sent to him to ask him to send me a few hundred pounds, sent me word, that if I dare speak against him, or write against him, he would put me into the pillory, or into the Bastille. He fancies that I swore myself to be a widow woman when I was examined at a Court Martial. But the Deputy Judge Advocate had more feeling than the gentleman who has examined me now, he told me I might say any thing out of the Court which it might be unpleasant to me to swear to; I told him it would be very improper for me to say that I was a married woman, when I had been known to be living with the Duke of York. I did not swear that I was a widow, I said it out of Court, and it was put into the Court Martial Minutes as if I had sworn to it, but it was not so. The Judge Advocate, to whom I told it, is at the door, and I think he had better be called in, I know now what he is come for."—This explanation of Mrs. Clarke is not at all contradicted by the evidence of the Deputy Judge Advocate, *Sutton*, who was called in on a subsequent day: He was asked, what passed, at the Court-Martial concerning Mrs. Clarke's being considered a widow; and he answered thus: "Having been directed to summon Mrs. Clarke, he applied to the Agent of Captain Thompson, who returned her as a widow, of Glouston Ledge, Essex. In conse-

"quence of such a description he admitted the usual oath to Mrs. Clarke, who answered every question put to her, and upon that charge Capt. Thompson was acquitted. Was sure he took the description from the Attorney, and that no interrogatory was put to her whether she was a widow or not?"—Thus, then, she did not swear herself a widow, and that imputation against her falls to the ground.—There is one witness who says, that her servant did, indeed, represent her, upon one occasion, as a dashing, or gay, young widow; it appears, that she was trusted under the presumption of her being so; and, it is probable enough, that she wished to be so thought, for the purpose of obtaining credit, as well as for other purposes; but, there is no proof of her ever having represented herself as a widow, except in the case of the court-martial.—As to the charge relating to the place of her marriage, being asked: "Was it true or not, that you were married at Berkhamstead?"—She answers: "I tell you I told it him laughing; and I told the Duke I was making a fool of him when I said that; for which his Royal Highness said he was very sorry, for that he was entirely in Mr. Adam's clutches."—To say the truth, there is very little in these allegations against her as a witness in this case. She would, from the nature of her situation, naturally wish to keep from the world the real facts relating to her family connections. To own poor relations; to lead our acquaintance down into our origin and to the low scenes whence we sprang, is not common; nor is it at all uncommon for people, even of unimpeachable veracity, to be weak enough to use all the arts of disguise in such cases.—During the examinations, it has been proved, I think, that she did pass, amongst some persons, for *Mrs. Dowler*. One witness says, that she called herself Mrs. Dowler; and she says, over and over again, that she never so represented herself, except in jest. There is little doubt of her having been looked upon, by some few people, as Mrs. Dowler; but, then, these two circumstances should be kept in view: first, that, with much pains to get at the fact, no one can be found to say, that, even when she was thought to be Mrs. Dowler, any letter ever came to her in that name, or in any other name than that of Mrs. Clarke; and, secondly, that this charge of calling herself *Mrs. Dowler* is manifestly at war with the other charge of calling herself a widow.—Much affected stress has been laid upon

her having asserted, that she said she had seen Mr. Dowler twice since his return from Portugal, when it now appears, that, besides that twice, she had not only seen him, but slept with him, at Reid's Hotel in St. Martin's Lane; and, as the twice had also been stated by Mr. Dowler, his general veracity, too, is impeached upon the same ground. But, I put it to any man, to any human being, whether, in such a case, the third time would not, by him, have been kept out of sight as long as possible? When asked how often they had seen one another, they said twice; so they had; the answer was true in words, but it was false in meaning, because the meaning was that they had seen one another no oftener than twice. There was deception in the answer; there was a moral offence in it; yet, is there one man or woman in the whole world, who would not, in such a case, have been strongly tempted to commit that offence? The fact clearly appears to be this: that Mr. Dowler, who seems to be a very clever man, has, for years, been her paramour; that, in his society, she has sought for a compensation for the drudgery and the disgust and loathing experienced in the society of the Duke; and that, accordingly, upon the very first night of his return from Portugal, she flew to his embraces; a circumstance which human nature, which the decency retained even by the lowest of prostitutes, bid her, as long as possible, abstain from stating to the world.—Another observation upon the general complexion of her testimony is this: that, in several instances, where her assertions have been contradicted by others; and particularly in the cases of Ludovick and Gen. Clavering, proof has afterwards been brought of the truth of her evidence, and of the erroneousness, not to call it wilful falsehood, of theirs.—She has been called, "*impudent baggage, infamous woman,*" and the like; and it has been much dwelt upon, that she had threatened vengeance against the Duke of York. Now, as to *general character*, there can be no doubt, that a woman like Mrs. Clarke is not to be believed so soon as a woman of perfectly virtuous character. But, then, we must consider, that, whatever degree of turpitude we, on account of her way of life, attribute to her, must be shared by her keeper, by the person, whose society she so long dwelt in. If we conclude that her mind has been vitiated, her morals destroyed by such a course of life; bare justice bids us also conclude, that his mind and his morals have undergone the same

degree of rain ; and, of course, that whatever we, on this account, take from her credibility, we must, on the other hand, add to the probability of his doing that which is vicious.—It appears, as I once before observed, that Mrs. Clarke did tell Mr. Robert Knight, that she would expose the Duke, unless she could bring him to terms ; and, indeed, she does not deny this, nor could she *possibly have any intention of denying it*, because she knew, and said, that Mr. Adam had her letters to the same amount, which letters are inserted below\*, and which letters, she must be quite sure, would not fail to be brought forth against any denial of her having threatened the Duke with an exposure. To an enraged woman (though, by the bye, to suppose her enraged

we must suppose her ill-used) ; to an enraged woman, we may, as I before observed, allow a pretty large portion of vindictiveness ; and, indeed, unsupported by other evidence, I should have no hesitation in saying, that she was not to be believed. Yet, I cannot help stating a case, bearing strongly upon this point, as to the principle of Evidence, which case occurred at the last Quarter Sessions held at Winchester.—Three men were indicted and tried for breaking into a barn and stealing wheat out of it. The *only witness*, to speak to the *fact itself*, was a common prostitute who, at midnight, had crept into a heap of straw, in the yard, to sleep. There were two women of her acquaintance, at the house of one of whom she had since resided, who gave evidence of some sus-

\* Sir,—On the 11th May, 1806, you waited on me by the desire of His R. H. the Duke of York, to state H. R. H.'s intention of allowing me an Annuity of four hundred per annum. H. R. H. by His promise is now indebted to me five hundred pounds. I have written repeatedly, but of no avail. H. R. H.'s conduct towards me has been so devoid of principle, feeling, and honour ; and as His promises are not to be depended on, though even given by you ; I have come to the determination of making my intentions known to you, for the consideration of H. R. H. ;—and thus it is :—I solicit H. R. H. to make the Annuity secure for my life, and to pay me the arrears immediately, as my necessities are very pressing (this he knows.)—If H. R. H. refuses to do this, I have no other mode for my immediate wants, than to publish every circumstance ever communicated to me by H. R. H. and every thing which has come under my knowledge during our intimacy, with all his letters ; these things amount to something serious : He is more within my power than may be imagined. Yet I wish for H. R. H.'s sake and my own, that He will make my request good, as I know full well I should suffer much in exposing Him in my own mind ; yet before I do any thing publicly, I will send to every one of H. R. H.'s family, a copy of what I mean to publish. Had H. R. H. only have been a little punctual, this request had never been made. One thing more : should H. R. H. throw up his protection to my Boy (for I thank Him much for the past) I hope He will place him on the foundation of the Charter-house or any other public school : the child is not ac-

countable for my conduct. You will please then, Sir, to state this communication to the Duke of York ; and on Wednesday I will send to your house, to know what may be H. R. H.'s intention ; which you will please to signify by a letter to Your must obedient, humble servant,—M. A. CLARKE.

Sunday morning, June 19.

His Royal Highness must feel, that His conduct on a late affair deserves all this from me, and more.

11 Hollies Street, Cavendish-square.

Sir,—On Wednesday, finding there was not any answer to my letter, I am led to infer, H. R. H. the Duke of York thinks proper not to make good his promise given by you, and that you encourage him in it. I have employed myself since, in committing to paper every circumstance within my recollection during the intimacy of H. R. H. and myself. The fifty or sixty letters of H. R. H. will give weight and truth to the whole. On Tuesday I have promised to give these up, if I hear nothing further after this last notice ; and when once given out of my own possession, it will be impossible to recall. It is to Gentlemen, and not any publisher they will be committed ; and those Gentlemen are just as obstinate as His Royal Highness, and more independent : they are acquaintances of your's ; and to relieve my wants, in pique to others will do what the Duke will not : however, He has it all within His own power, and so He may act as He pleases.—I am, Sir, Your most obedient, M. A. CLARKE.

Saturday morning.

picious conduct of the prisoners, with respect to their tampering with the witness to get out of the way. But, there was, on the side of the prisoners, evidence going far towards proving an alibi with respect to one of them; another witness was brought, who said, that one of the prisoners having accused the girl of giving him the foul disease, she said *she would be up with him*. It was proved, too, that when before the magistrate, she had said, that she would *swear to* but one of the three prisoners. Yet, were they, upon the positive testimony of this one witness, and she a common prostitute, found guilty of the charge for which they had been indicted; and, I well remember, that the Chairman, Mr. Borough, a very clever man, and a lawyer of great experience, observed to the jury, that, though some allowance was to be made for the general character of the principal witness, yet her immoralities, of the sort alluded to, ought not to be considered as sufficient to cast any great degree of discredit upon her testimony, in a case where those immoralities could be supposed to have had little, or no, influence upon her conduct. Indeed, if evidence like this were rejected, how could crimes be punished? In, perhaps, four cases out of five, great guilt is established by the mouths of persons, in some degree, guilty. Vice punishes itself. If accomplices are not to be accusers; if their evidence is not to be taken, is it not manifest, that there is an end of that great check upon crimes; namely, *the fear of being betrayed?*—Submitting these more general observations to the consideration of the reader, I now return to the case immediately before us, bearing in mind, that the only question, which we have, in this case, to settle in our minds, is, whether the Duke of York did, or did not *know*, that Mrs. Clarke was concerned in, and took money for, the effecting of the exchange between Knight and Brooke.—We have her positive declaration, that he knew of *all* her proceedings in this way, which declaration is strongly corroborated by the Duke's own letters, wherein he so familiarly speaks to her of the requests of General Clavering and Dr. O'Meara, bidding her tell the former that he is mistaken in the ground of his application; and we have her declaration as to his knowledge of her practices in this case in particular.—Now, opposed to this, we have the testimony of Mr. Robert Knight, upon whose evidence, as thus opposed, I have only to repeat my former observations.—Mr. Knight, who, after the exchange got ac-

quainted with Mrs. Clarke, says, that she desired him, to keep the matter *a secret*, and that she expressly gave as a reason for this, her fear of the consequences, if it should reach the *Duke of York's ears*. This statement Mrs. Clarke positively denies. Which are we to believe? Mrs. Clarke, who took the bribe, or Mr. Knight, who gave the bribe, and who first tendered the bribe? Character, here, is quite out of the question. People may say what they will about Mr. Knight's having been a member of the honourable House. So have many others that I could name. We here see Mr. Robert Knight as a *briber*; and, the parties being in this respect, upon a level, we must decide between their opposite assertions upon the *internal probabilities* of the case.—Mr. Knight was asked, *what part* of the transaction Mrs. Clarke wished to have kept a secret; and, whether it was solely the *money* part of it; he answered, that the *whole transaction might be concealed from the Duke*. This question was put so often, and the reports in all the news-papers so exactly correspond with respect to the answer, that there is very little probability of its being incorrect.—Now, then, let it be remarked, that Mr. Knight went to thank Mrs. Clarke for the use of her influence in the case of his brother's exchange, having before paid her £200 for that influence; and, was it *probable*, that Mrs. Clarke should express to Mr. Knight a wish, calculated to make him believe, that *she had not at all interfered in the matter with the Duke of York?* Nay, Mr. Knight himself says, that he looked upon the thing as having been done by her influence, and further, that *she took credit to herself for it*; but, how could she, if she pretended that she had induced the Duke to do it; how could she, at that same time, have the folly to express a wish, that her having had any hand in the business might be kept from the knowledge of the Duke; kept from the knowledge of that very person, who, if her claim to Mr. Knight's £200 was not fraudulent as well as corrupt, must have known that she was the cause of the exchange? Will any one believe, that Mrs. Clarke would say, “It was I who prevailed upon the Duke to permit of your brother's exchange; but for God's sake, don't let the Duke know of it.” Why, there is a manifest absurdity in the supposition. It is a thing too preposterous to be believed. That she might, indeed, desire Knight not to *blab*; not to talk of the transaction for it to reach the Duke's ears through *third parties*;

this is likely enough, and this she herself admits may have been the case; but to suppose, that she expressed a fear of the Duke's knowing of her having been the instrument in the business: to suppose, that she expressed such a fear to the very man with whom *she was taking credit to herself* for having obtained the grant *from the Duke*, is an absurdity too gross to be for one moment entertained by any man in his senses.—As to the evidence of Ludovick about the getting the note changed, I before made these observations:—If what Ludovick Armor says be true; namely, that no other servant of the Duke ever went to Mrs. Clarke's, and that he never took a note to change from that house, what Mrs. Clarke says about sending the note to change *must* be false. That is quite clear. But, bare justice to the fair annuitant compels us to observe, that this falsehood, if we set it down for one, must have been a mere freak of fancy; for, it would, I think, be impossible to assign, or conceive, any *reason* for her stating it. Of itself there was nothing in it, either good or bad. To have said, that she merely *shewed* the Duke the money would have answered fall as well for all the purposes of accusation and of criminalation. It is quite impossible to guess at any end she could have in view by telling such a falsehood, except that of bringing forth Ludovick Armor; or of affording a chance of being exposed as a false witness. If, therefore, she be a false witness, a fabricator of false accusations, we must, I think, allow her to be as awkward an one as ever appeared at any bar in the world.—These observations occurred to me before I had seen the examinations of Pierson and Mrs. Favourite; but, they have now put the matter beyond all doubt, that Ludovick's *memory*, though refreshed by questions, *before he came to the House*, put to him by the Duke, by Mr. Adam (one of the judges in this case), by Mr. Lowten, and by Mr. Wilkinson, did, upon this occasion, fail him.—Colonel Gordon's evidence has in it nothing *positive*. It speaks, indeed, to the general regularity of conducting business in the office of the commander in chief; the Colonel *firmly* believes, that he made his report, as usual, to the Duke as to the fitness of the exchange, though he *kept no minutes* of the inquiry, upon which the report was founded; and he has not the *smallest doubt*, that the Duke acted solely upon that report, unbiased by any other influence whatever. For the Colonel's *opinions* we may have a very

great respect, especially as he appears to have had so much to do with the illustrious personage, whose conduct was the subject of inquiry; but, with all due deference to the Colonel, *opinions* are not facts; nor will they, in the mind of any impartial man, weigh one grain against positive and corroborated testimony.—In his speech, stating the charges, Mr. Wardle, at the first opening of the business, stated the exchange of Knight and Brooke to have been concluded on the 25th of July. It now appears, that it was not gazetted till the 30th; and, observe, it has been attempted to be shewn, that the thing was done without the aid of Mrs. Clarke, because Colonel Gordon has produced a document to shew, that the Duke gave his sanction to the exchange on the 23rd of July, just as if Mr. Wardle had ever pretended to *name the day* when the application was made to Mrs. Clarke! He merely misstated the date of the gazette, a mis-statement which could not possibly be intentional, because there was the gazette to refer to. But, what is this document? What is this written proof, that the Duke gave his sanction to the exchange on the 23rd of July? Why, it is a document, in which the material part, the only words that are material, are found written in PENCIL! The exchange was not *gazetted*, it appears, till seven days after it was approved of by the Duke, though there must have been one gazetting day between; not till seven days after the Duke is, in *pencil*, stated to have approved of it. In *pencil*, reader, you will please to bear in mind; always keep in mind, that it was in *pencil*. I wonder what judges and juries would say of documents, of written evidence, partly in *pencil*?—Colonel Gordon states, however, positively, that the Duke of York went to Weymouth on the 31st of July; which is important, because the gazette, in which the exchange of Knight and Brooke appeared, was published on the 30th of July, and Mrs. Clarke says, that she received the £. 200 before the Duke went to Weymouth. This brings the whole of the operations, subsequent to the gazette, into a crowded space. She sent the gazette to Dr. Thynne; Dr. Thynne sent it to Mr. Knight; Mr. Knight sent her the money; she shewed the money to the Duke; and all this must, if true, have taken place, between some time in the day of the 30th, and some time in the night of the 31st, or in the morning of the 1st of August; that is to say, if Colonel Gordon be correct as to the day of the

Duke's setting off for Weymouth. Yet is there nothing, that I can perceive, at all incredible in this rapidity. If Mr. Knight got the gazette on the 30th, he would not, after the pressing note from Mrs. Clarke to Dr. Thynne, fail to send her the money the next day; on that day the Duke, before his departure, would naturally go, as the witnesses stated he did go, to Mrs. Clarke's; she would, if ever, then shew him the money; and, of course, if she got the note, or notes, or one of them changed, through him, that was the very time, when she would get it done. All the servants agree, that the Duke was there on the day, and in a part, at least, of the night previous to his departure for Weymouth, and Mrs. Favourite, perfectly corroborated by Pier-  
son, says that she gave Ludovick a note to get changed; and she further says, that she took up the change and delivered it to the Duke and Mrs. Clarke in bed.—Now, reader, dismiss from your mind all prejudice; all bias; and ask yourself, whether it be possible for such a story as this is all through; so many concurrent circumstances, flowing from so many quarters, to unite by mere accident; or by any thing short of the power of one great and prevailing truth. Ask yourself, whether the evidence of Mr. Adam to character, and the evidence of Ludovick and Colonel Gordon to fact, is sufficient to weigh against all that has been laid before you in support of this charge.

#### CASE OF CAPT. MALING.

Mr. Wardle, when he brought forward his Charges, stated, that there was a man, in the office of Greenwood, the Agent, who had risen to the rank of *Captain* in the army without having ever done one day's military duty, and without having even joined any regiment. Upon the examination taking place in the House, it appeared, that Mr. Wardle had made a mistake; not, however, as to the nature of the case, or the name of the person; but as to the office in which that person was, it appearing, that the person was a clerk in the office of the Duke of York and not in that of Greenwood.—And here we have an instance of the manner, in which *Colonel Gordon* gave information to the House. When first called in, he was asked: "What were the merits and ser-  
" vices that obtained Capt. Maling his  
" rapid promotion, and the gift of his three  
" commissions?" His answer is; "I will  
" state them to the House." He then goes on to shew, from documents in his pos-

session, that he was recommended thus and thus, and that he had served thus and thus; and, though the promotion was very rapid indeed, and seems not to be accounted for upon the score of service, it does appear that the person in question had been engaged in actual military service.—Upon this being made appear, Mr. Wardle was disposed to withdraw this charge: "No, no!" said the friends of the Duke. No. It shall not be withdrawn; it shall stand for us to decide upon it.—The *Colonel* was then examined as to other matters; and, before he was ordered to withdraw, it occurred to some one, that a mistake, as to the office, had been made; and the *Colonel* was asked: "What were the services of Captain Maling's brother, who is, I believe, a captain in the army, who is in the war-office?"—Now, mark the answer; mark this answer well. "There is a Captain Maling, an assistant of mine, in the office of the Commander in Chief; I take for granted that is the person referred to. What his services are as a Lieutenant I really do not know; I found him as a Lieutenant in the office of the Commander in Chief; and in consideration of his extraordinary good character, and more than common abilities, the promotions of the army going through his hands under mine, I did recommend him to His Royal Highness the Commander in Chief, to be placed upon the half-pay as a Captain, upon which half-pay he most assuredly will be placed as soon as an opportunity offers; but the Commander in Chief has it not in his power."—He is then asked: "Do you know whether, or not, that Captain Maling ever joined, or did duty with, any regiment?"—His answer is: "I do not know that he did; and I do not think that he did."—Whence we may conclude, with perfect safety, that he never did; so that the charge of Mr. Wardle is completely established, the circumstance of a mistake in the office being of no importance at all.—This is a case, which involves no direct pecuniary corruption; but it is worthy of as much attention as any one of the whole; for here, we see, that the offices of the army have been made *sinecures*, and, if this be tolerated, let the reader judge to what a length it may be, and, perhaps, already has been, carried, in an establishment consisting of from 12,000 to 15,000 commissioned and staff officers. I, in my last, observed upon the consequences of *leaves of absence*; I noticed

th particular case of the *younger Sheridan*; but, what must we expect if the rank and pay, as military officers, are given to clerks in offices? If to clerks, why not to any who are not clerks? Why not to butlers and footmen? Why not to any body? There is no knowing where the terrible abuse will terminate.—This man *never joined* any regiment? Yet he must be a Captain of some company in some regiment, and, perhaps, in one of those regiments which were serving in Spain. Is not this pretty encouragement for officers who actually do serve? Is not this a shameful injury to that service, for which the people so dearly pay? —He has been thus promoted for his “extraordinary good character, and more than common abilities.” Abilities in what? In what; why, “the promotions of the army going through his hands under mine,” says the Colonel, with singular modesty. But, what have these abilities; this more than common abilities in copying letters, filling up blank commissions, and making memorandums, in *pencil*, in the margin of applications; what have these “more than common abilities” to do with military command, which demands not only abilities of quite a different description, but requires also the presence of the person *with the army*. Besides, has not Captain Maling his salary as a clerk? Aye, and a salary, too, quite adequate to his services. We pay him that salary, and he ought not to be suffered to step in and take military rank and pay from men, who venture their lives for their country. He lies snug at the Horse Guards, while the person, who is supplying his place in the regiment, the person who is doing that duty for which Captain Maling has rank and pay, has his head exposed to the sabre or the bayonet of the enemy. Can there be an instance, more complete than this, of crying injustice? Is it possible that the real officers of the army should be content under such a system of distributing the benefits of rank and pay? Is it possible, that an army, thus treated, should be what it ought to be? And, is it not impudence unparalleled, to praise the management of the army, while such a case as this stands recorded in evidence, at the bar of the House? Oh! Colonel Gordon! Colonel Gordon, you who require a man of “uncommon abilities” to manage the promotions “under you;” what do you think would be the answer of the Emperor Napoleon, if his war-minister were to say to him:

“There is a man who is uncommonly clever at filling up blank-commissions and making memorandums and copying letters; and, therefore, I would recommend him to your Majesty as a mighty proper person to command a company of foot, letting him still remain a clerk ‘in my office?’” What do you think would be, in such a case, the answer of Napoleon? —It is not thus that *triumphings* are managed, Colonel Gordon.—But, observe, the curious account that the Colonel gives of what was intended to be done with this Captain Maling of “uncommon abilities.” He recommended him, he says, to the Commander in Chief, to be placed upon *half-pay* as a Captain. But, he is upon *full-pay*! The Duke, he tells us, has not the power to place him upon *half-pay*; but he has had the power to place him upon *full-pay*, where he now is! Oh! wonderfully fine regulations! Oh! the “excellent regularity” of conducting things in the office of the Commander in Chief! I am delighted with this idea of “regularity.” It does form, as Mr. Cripps seemed to think, such a famous set-off against all the thumping charges relating to jobbing and corruption.

#### CASE OF FRENCH AND SANDON.

This case opens to us a most extensive field of corruption and profligacy. In the evidence, relating to this case, we have a view of the whole system; and, therefore, it is worthy of particular notice, not only in its substance, but in the whole of its detail.—It is proved by documentary evidence, that, on the 30th of April, 1804, *Colonel French* and *Capt. Huxley Sandon* obtained a Letter of Service, as it is quaintly called; or, in plain English, an authority, to raise 5,000 men for the army; and that this authority, and bargain, was granted and made through the power of the Commander in Chief, the transaction being one that originated in his office.—The proposition of a *loan* to the Duke comes out incidentally.

*Capt. Huxley Sandon* states, that a Mr. Cockayne, his attorney, having told him, that if he wanted any thing done at the War-office, he knew a person who could do it, he was led to the transaction in question, in conjunction with Col. French; that there was an agent of Mrs. Clarke, a Mr. Corri, a music-master, who was to introduce them; that the original bargain was, that Mrs. Clarke was to receive £. 525, and Mr. Corri £. 200 for the in-

K

troduction, the former sum to be increased, at his discretion, if they were successful in their levy, to £.2,000.

*Mr. Corri* states, that Sandon did apply to him, and commissioned him to offer Mrs. Clarke £.2,000 for her assistance; that he, in consequence, did apply to Mrs. Clarke; and that, in June, 1804, he received two hundred pounds for himself, from Sandon, which £.200 he gave to Mr. Cockayne, to whom he was in debt.

*Mr. Dowler* states, that he saw Col. French and Capt. Sandon at Mrs. Clarke's; that, by desire of Mrs. Clarke, he spoke to them, several times, upon the subject of the levy; that Mrs. Clarke told him, that she was to receive 1,000 guineas, and a guinea a man, until the levy of 5,000 men should be completed. To this he adds:—"I was also present when Colonel French or Captain Sandon, I don't know which, gave Mrs. Clarke £.500 of it. I afterwards saw Colonel French at Mrs. Clarke's, when he stated to her, that it was not possible to procure the number of men at the usual bounty, and begged that the number of boys should be increased in the levy, which, as I understand, was afterwards done."—Upon being asked what cause she assigned for doing such things, he says: "She said the Duke of York was so distressed for money that she could not bear to ask him for any, and that that was the only way by which she could support her establishment."

*Mr. Grant* (agent to Colonel French and Capt. Sandon's levy) states, that French and Sandon told him that they had got the levy through the influence of a friend, which friend he afterwards found to be Mrs. Clarke; that they told him this; that he understood she was to receive 500 guineas at first, and afterwards a guinea a man for every man raised; that he was told, by French and Sandon, that she actually received several sums from them; that he accepted a bill of £.200; that they told him they had actually paid her £.1,700; that he recollects that Colonel French applied to him about a loan of £.5,000 to the Duke of York, but that he took no steps upon it; that he recollects, that an observation was made, that it might be advanced, provided the arrears of the levy were paid up by government, but does not recollect, whether the observation came from himself, or from Col. French.

It was now, when Mr. Grant's examination was closed, nearly two o'clock in the

morning of the 8th of February, and, upon the propriety of calling Mrs. Clarke, the following very interesting and memorable discussion took place in the House, as reported in the news-papers.—*LORD FOLKESTONE* called the attention of gentlemen to the exhausted state of the hon. member who brought forward the motion, the state of the House, and the lateness of the hour, and proposed an adjournment.

—(*A cry of "Go on! go on!"*)—*MR. PERCEVAL* observed, that many Members appeared to be impressed with the belief that the purposes of justice required that Mrs. Clarke should be examined to night, and in that sentiment he was much inclined to concur. As justice was the object of all, he hoped that Mrs. Clarke would be called in and examined. Without her evidence, the whole that had been said was nothing, as the Duke of York had not been implicated.—*MR. WARDLE* said that the right hon. gentleman need not have so strongly urged upon him *a regard to justice*. If the Committee thought that justice required it, he was ready to proceed.

—*Mrs. Clarke was then ordered to be called.*

—*MR. WHARTON* (the Chairman) stated that Mrs. Clarke was so exhausted that she begged to be indulged with a chair. [A chair was accordingly ordered.] He then said, that he found from the Serjeant at Arms, that he had mis-stated the message, which was a request from Mrs. Clarke that she might not be examined to-night. Mrs. Clarke, however, was called in. She stated that she had attended for eight hours, that her feelings had been excessively harassed during this examination; and that she was so excessively fatigued that she could not give her evidence to-night.—*THE CHAIRMAN* told her, that the Committee, in consideration of her fatigue, had ordered a chair for her.

—*Mrs. CLARKE*—“*A chair will not relieve the fatigue of my mind.*”—The witness was then ordered to withdraw.—*MR. YORKE* adverted to the necessity, with a view to the purposes of justice, that the witness should be examined, lest some undue communication with the witnesses already examined should take place. He thought, therefore, that she ought to be examined, or kept in the custody of the Serjeant at Arms, and none of these witnesses admitted to her presence till the House met again. He did not know but there might be precedents for keeping witnesses in this way.

—*THE SPEAKER* said that there were certainly no such precedents in modern times, and the House ought to pause before they

came to a decision upon a point in which the liberty of the subject was so much concerned.—Mr. SHERIDAN said that after what the witness had said under circumstances that certainly added weight to her assertion, it was impossible for the Committee to proceed to the examination. The idea on the other hand, of locking her up, was contrary to every principle of propriety. The only remaining course was to do neither; and this was an inconvenience incident to their proceedings. Gentlemen ought to recollect, that justice was concerned in her giving her testimony in a state in which she could give it properly; and unless the House took care that this should be done, they would be considered rather as Parties than as Judges.—Mr. WARDLE read a note from Mrs. Clarke, requesting that he would come to her, as she was extremely indisposed.—Mr. ADAM said, that in the dilemma to which they were reduced there appeared no proper mode of acting but agreeing to postpone the examination, and to allow any communication with the other witnesses to go to her credit.—Mr. CANNING agreed in what had been said by the last speaker, but added that she might learn in the interval what the other witnesses had said without any direct communication, and the only way to bring this to a question of credit, was to call her now, and ask her whether any such communication had taken place. To this point she could undoubtedly answer, however much exhausted.—Mr. WHITBREAD conceived that the House world best consult its dignity, by allowing the hon. member to pursue the course of proceeding which he had a right to act upon. But even though it was unwilling to accede to such a principle, he begged leave to ask the House, whether a female, in attendance for eight hours, and of course suffering much suspense, had not some claim upon the generous feelings of the House, without any reference to the immediate person to whom that feeling was extended. To speak under such circumstances of committing Mrs. Clarke, he trusted would not meet the support of any man in that House. (*Hear, hear!*)—Mr. CANNING deprecated any such severity, (*Hear, hear!*) at the same time that he was alive to the necessity of putting certain questions to Mrs. Clarke, relative to any communication which she might have received from any of the witnesses examined that night. He still thought that a more preferable method might be pursued, to

which on any side he could see no objection, namely, to call Mr. Dowler again to the bar, and examine him relative to any communication with that lady.—(*Hear, hear, from all sides.—Mr. Dowler was then called to the Bar.*)—He stated that the only communication he had with Mrs. Clarke, since he had left the Bar, was an acquiescence with her wish to procure for her some refreshment. He had abstained from any conversation, not from any advice communicated to him, but from a consciousness that it was the line of duty which he ought to pursue under such circumstances.

*Mrs. Clarke* (the proceedings being resumed) states, that French and Sandon did apply to her for the levy, but, though she has read the news-papers, she cannot perfectly call to her mind the sums she received from them; that they certainly promised her a pecuniary reward; that, in consequence of that promise, she applied, in their behalf, to the Duke, that she informed the Duke that she was to receive a pecuniary compensation; that the Duke, upon this, promised that the parties should have the levy; that she collects one sum of £.500 that she received, which went in part payment of a service of plate for the house in Gloucester Place; that the Duke told her he paid the remainder of the money for the plate; that the parties did apply to her for alterations in the conditions of the levy, and that she always gave their notes to the Duke, but did not always know what they meant; that French told her, that if the Duke would pass his accounts, which were correct, and expected to have been passed some time before, he and his agent would accommodate him with a loan of £.5,000, on proper security and at legal interest; that she spoke of this to the Commander in Chief; that the Duke said, that he could not demand money from the different officers, that besides, that it was a delicate business, as the thing might be known; that the loan was not made.

*Miss Taylor* was next called, and, as her evidence is of such very great importance, I shall give in the question and answer, as I find it reported in the Morning Chronicle.

BY MR. WARDLE.

Were you in the habit of visiting at Gloucester-place when Mrs. Clarke was under the protection of the Duke of York?—Frequently.

Have you ever heard the Duke of York

speak to Mrs. Clarke relative to Colonel French's levy?—Onee.

Relate what passed at that time.—The Duke's words were, as nearly as I can recollect, “I am continually wearied by Col. ‘French about his levy. He is always wanting something more to be done in his favour, ‘How does he behave to you, Darling?’”

Does the witness recollect any thing further passing than what she has stated?—Mrs. Clarke replied, “Middling; not ‘very well.’”

Was that the whole of the conversation?—No.

Relate the rest.—The Duke said, “Master French must mind what he is about, else ‘I will soon cut up him and his levy ‘too.’”

BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

How long have you known Mrs. Clarke?—Ten years.

Not longer?—I cannot exactly recollect.

Where did you know her first?—At her house at Bayswater, near the Gravel Pits.

Where do you live yourself?—At Chelsea.

With whom did you live when you first knew Mrs. Clarke?—With my parents.

What was your father?—A Gentleman. Do you live with her now?—No.

Is he living?—Yes.

Is your mother living?—Yes.

Do you live with her?—No.

With whom do you live?—With my sister.

Is she married?—No; she is a single woman.

Where resident?—At Chelsea.

In a lodging or a house?—In a house.

In what line of life is she?—She keeps a boarding-school.

In what part of Bayswater did Mrs. Clarke live?—She lived in Craven Place.

Who lived with her?—Her husband.

Did he always live with her?—He did when first I knew her.

Did you know any other person to live with her?—Yes.

Whom?—His Royal Highness the Duke of York.

Do you not know that she has lived with other persons since?—Not to my knowledge.

Are you intimately acquainted with her?—Yes.

Not related to her?—My brother is married to her sister.

Did you know her at Tavistock-place?—Yes.

Did her husband live with her there?—I never saw him there. I understood that Mrs. Clarke lived in Tavistock-place with her mother.

What time elapsed between her leaving her husband and her living with the Duke of York?—I cannot recollect.

How long ago since she knew Mrs. Clarke at Bayswater?—About ten years.

Had her husband left her before she left Bayswater?—I do not know.

Are you prepared to stand by that?—Yes.

What was her husband?—I always understood him to be a man of some fortune.

Do you not know that he had only £50 annuity, and that paid weekly?—No.

Did you ever see her husband with her during the latter part of the period she lived at Bayswater?—No.

Where did she go to reside from Bayswater?—I do not recollect.

Does the witness recollect her living in Park-lane?—Mrs. Clarke called upon her one day and said she lived then in Park-lane.

Did you ever live with her in Tavistock-place?—I never lived with her at all.

Did you never sleep in the house?—Yes, frequently.

Do you know that any body lived with her, but her husband?—Yes.

You took her then for a modest decent woman?—She lived with her mother, and I knew nothing then to the contrary.

What is your father's name?—The same name as mine.

His Christian name?—James.

Where does he live now?—I should rather be excused answering.

A Debate intervened here, of which I shall give the report, from the same paper.—Lord FOLKESTONE said that the whole of the learned gentleman's examination appeared to be for the purpose of catching the witness tripping. As to any reference to the investigation, he could see none in the question which the witness expressed her unwillingness to answer.—The ATTORNEY GENERAL defended the propriety of his examination. A person was produced, of whom no person knew any thing, unless that she was the sister-in-law of a very questionable witness. In such a case was not inquiry into the character and connexions of such a witness necessary? Would not much of her character for credit, depend upon a knowledge of the situation of life in which herself and her connections moved? (No! no!

*Order! order!*) He by no means insinuated that poverty or humility of life were to be construed into objections against the validity of statements, where the persons making them had uniformly supported a good character; But he had still a right to contend that when persons wholly unknown, except by the good accounts they gave of themselves, were brought forward upon serious inquiries, he or any other Member had a right to inquire into every circumstance of their previous life, and of their connexions.—Gen. STEWART begged to say one word, viz. that if there was one Member who took up more of the time of the Committee by numerous questions, it was the Noble Lord (Folkestone) opposite.—Lord FOLKESTONE. If he had taken up the time of the Committee unnecessarily, he would feel extreme regret. At the same time that he could not surrender his own opinion, that the Attorney General's examination did not at all bear upon the point. Indeed, from his own observations, it was obvious that the only thing he pretended to know about that witness, he could not know, namely, that she was the sister-in-law of Mrs. Clarke, as he asserted, but which she denied.—Sir G. WARRENDER supported the propriety of the questions put by his Noble Friend (Folkestone)—they were, in his opinion, of the most vital importance.—Mr. SHERIDAN trusted that unless the Attorney General felt the absolute necessity of the question, he would not trespass on the private feelings of the witness by continuing to press it.

#### BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

I must repeat my question. Where is your father now?—I do not know.

By MR. PERCEVAL.

Does the witness mean to rest her credit upon the veracity of that answer?

MR. BRAND. There may be circumstances of real and serious difficulties, where it would be inconsistent with the best feelings of the heart, and a violation of parental duty, not to deny the residence of a father. The question may be a legal one, but he trusted, other motives of equal urgency would operate on the Chancellor of the Exchequer not to press it.—The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER conceived, That honourable gentleman had assumed difficulties, which he had no right to do. He could only attribute the disinclination of the witness to state certain circumstances, to her anxiety to evade that dis-

covery, which would be fatal to the credit of her testimony.—Mr. WILBERFORCE had a strong objection to the manner in which the question was put, it appeared like BROWBEATING THE WITNESS. He by no means attributed such an intention to his right hon. friend, although a system may be contracted from legal habits. He recommended that the answer of the witness should be left to the opinion which the Committee would subsequently pronounce.—Mr. KENRICK stated, that he had heard from another person, that the person to whom the question referred, had been arrested within a few hours.—Mr. YORKE justified the question, as put by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Every means should be exerted to ascertain the character of the persons produced in support of those accusations. If such vigilance was not exercised, street-walkers from off the Strand, would probably be introduced at the bar of that House to criminate the character of the Duke of York.

#### EXAMINATION RESUMED.

When did you see your father last?—About a fortnight ago.

Where did he live last?—At Chelsea.

In what street?—I do beg to decline answering.

For what reason?—I do not like to tell so large an assembly where I live.

What objection can you have to tell where yourself and sister live, representing yourselves, as you do, to keep a boarding-school?—I stated my reasons before.

What fears have you from so large an assembly?—They will find me to be poor, and will therefore doubt my veracity.

MR. PERCEVAL.

Be assured your veracity will not be doubted on account of your poverty.—I live at No. 8, Cheyne-row, Chelsea.

Do you and your sister keep a boarding-school?—My sister and I do.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Did you often see Mrs. Clarke in company with the Duke of York?—Yes.

How often?—I cannot recollect; three weeks seldom passed but I did.

How long have you kept the boarding-school?—Two years and a half, altogether, in Kentish-town and Chelsea.

When you were at Kentish-town, where did your father live?—I have an objection to say any thing about my father.

Where did witness live at the time she heard his royal highness speak to Mrs. Clarke about Colonel French?—Cannot positively say; but that it was before she

went to live at Kentish-town.

Where did you live before that?—At Islington, to which place we went from Bayswater.

What part of Islington?—Dalby Terrace.

Do you know Mr. Wardle?—Yes.

How long?—Two or three months.

At whose request do you attend here to-night?—At Mrs. Clarke's.

Did you ever see Mr. Dowler at Gloucester-place?—Yes.

Did you ever see him in company with the Duke of York?—No.

Did you ever hear from Mrs. Clarke, that she introduced Mr. Dowler to the Duke of York as her brother?—No.

Do you believe your father's affairs to be in a state of embarrassment?—Yes.

*Mrs. Hovenden* (who is proved to have been a regular trader in commissions and the like) being called on a subsequent day, respecting the affair of Col. Shaw, and being incidentally asked about *Miss Taylor*, states, that she saw her *once* with her brother Capt. Taylor; that of her own knowledge, she can say nothing of *Miss Taylor's* reputation; that she did once say, that she should not return her visit, as she had heard *something unpleasant*. Being put to the test as to what this unpleasant thing was, she says: “Being ‘hear-say, I believe, I should not tell ‘what I hear. I know nothing of myself.’” She was then asked: “Of your own ‘knowledge of *Miss Taylor*, would you ‘believe her evidence?’” She answers: “I declare I do not see how I can answer ‘such a question as that. It is mere ‘matter of opinion. I cannot say.’” Being asked how her delicacy permitted her to *visit* Mrs. Clarke, she answers, that she did not *visit* her; she went to her on *business*.—*Mr. WHITBREAD* observed here, that, from what he had seen of the two ladies, he should be inclined to ask *Miss Taylor* her opinion of *Mrs. Hovenden*.

*Pierson*, the butler, is asked, whether he recollects to have seen *Miss Taylor* at the house in Gloucester-place. He states that he saw her there very frequently, and that she dined there often; but, that he does not recollect her dining there when the Duke did.

*Thomas Walker*, late coachman to *Mrs. Clarke*, saw *Miss Taylor* frequently at Gloucester-place.

*Mrs. Favourite*, the house-keeper, states that *Miss Taylor* very frequently visited at Gloucester-place, and when the Duke of York was there.

There is no need at all of adding *Mrs. Clarke's* testimony to that of this crowd of witnesses as to the fact of *Miss Taylor* being upon terms of intimacy at Gloucester Place, and of her being frequently there at the same time with the Duke; but, as *Miss Taylor's* evidence is of such vast weight; as it goes to the very vitals of this case, and, indeed, by corroboration, of all the cases, we must not omit a record of the following occurrence, which took place on the 17th instant.—*MR. WARDLE* stated that he had that morning received a letter from *Miss ANN TAYLOR*, complaining of the conduct of another witness, which he asked permission to read. The hon. gentleman then read the letter to the following effect:—“Sir,—I understand “that *Mrs. Hovenden*, on her examination “at the Bar of the House of Commons, stat-“ed that she had not returned me a visit I “paid her, in consequence of some imputa-“tion upon my character. In contradiction “to that, I have to state that she visited “me twice; once at Bayswater, and again “at Dalby Terrace. She also said she “would not entrust me with a child of “hers, but yet she sent her niece, of 14 years “of age, to visit me. I am, &c.—*ANN TAYLOR*.—*MR. WILLIAM SMITH* begged leave to recall the attention of the Committee to the letter produced by an honourable member, and signed “*Ann Taylor*.” If there was any proceeding in the course of this business, marked with peculiar and unmerited harshness, towards an individual, it was in the treatment this poor unprotected girl had met with. (*Hear, hear! from several members!*) There could be nothing more unjustifiable. The only shadow of disgrace that attached to this girl's conduct, as far as fell within the knowledge of the Committee, was her knowing such a .... *THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER* rose to order. The hon. gent. was, in his opinion, pursuing a most disorderly course. He might, if he pleased, call the witness to the Bar to disprove any evidence that had been given which she conceived to be imminent to her, but he could not enter into the discussion of the hardships she had undergone. If he had been inclined to do this, he ought to have done it at the time she was examined, when the impression was fresh in the minds of every one, and not at such a distance of time, when it was likely to provoke reply, and retard more material business. For if the honourable gentleman was allowed to go into this argument, those who were accused of imposing the hardships complained of would have

an equal right to defend themselves, and thus the time of the house would be consumed.—Mr. Smith contended that, the letter being read, he had taken the most proper time to ask if any proceedings were to follow upon it.—Why, Mr. Perceval, this was “material business;” it was by far more material than the inquiry about the *alleged forgery*! Aye, or the statement about the sums, which the Duke says he expended upon Mrs. Clarke’s establishment! Aye, a vast deal more material than either. Mrs. Hovenden, the regular trader, was called upon for her opinion of Miss Taylor’s credibility; if what Miss Taylor now states be true, that which Mrs. Hovenden stated even respecting her opinions of Miss Taylor, is false; and, sir, the people, are, I can assure you, all alive as to the credibility of Miss Taylor.

Having now stated the substance of the oral testimony, it only remains to be observed, that Colonel Gordon came again, with an abundance of documents, and most clearly proved, that, with respect to the levy of French and Sandon, *all was PERFECTLY REGULAR again in the books at the War-office, and in the office of the Commander in Chief.* The reader is, indeed, told, by Sandon, one of the principals, that he made a bargain with Cockayne to give Corri £.200 for an introduction to Mrs. Clarke, and that a bargain was made with Mrs. Clarke to give her a sum in cash, and a guinea a man, for the letter of service; he is told by Corri that he got the £.200; he is told by Dowler that he saw French and Sandon give Mrs. Clarke some of the money; he is told by Grant, the agent to the levy, that French and Sandon told him, that they paid her in all, £.1,700; he is told by Mrs. Clarke that the Duke granted the letter of service upon her telling him that she was to have money for it from French and Sandon; and, lastly, he is told by Miss Taylor, whose character and credibility remains unimpeached, that she heard the Duke say to Mrs. Clarke, that he was continually wearied by French about his levy, who was always wanting something more to be done in his favour! that she then heard the Duke ask Mrs. Clarke, how French behaved to her, and, upon Mrs. Clarke’s replying: “ middling, not very ‘well,’ ” the Duke said: “ Master French ‘must mind what he is about, else I will ‘soon cut up him and his levy too.’ ” All this the reader is told by witnesses, for the far greater part, unwilling ones. If he regards the regularity of Colonel Gordon’s

books as sufficient to destroy all this evidence, then he must acquit the Duke; but if he does not, he must conclude that the Duke is guilty.

With the above cases (enough, probably, for one week’s reading) I shall, for the present, content myself, especially as there appears to be fresh matter still coming forward, connected with some of the other cases.—In my next I shall continue the *analysis*, and never quit it till every case is fairly before my readers, and safely placed beyond the power of oblivion, or of misrepresentation.—There will also be to be performed another task of this sort, to wit, an analytical view of the conduct of the *House of Commons*, upon this important occasion. It will require much time and patience to go over the whole of the proceedings, draw together and to put upon record, the conduct and sentiments of the different members who have taken part in the discussions. Yet, this is absolutely necessary to be done.—In the mean while, there is one particular debate, which has arisen, incidentally, out of these proceedings, and which debate calls for immediate attention, as involving statements and principles of a general and very interesting nature. I would beseech the reader to bear in mind, that it is not merely the conduct of the Duke of York that is now before the public, but that system of corruption, of which the facts, now brought to light, now dragged out by the hair of the head, after having been discovered by accident; that system of corruption and of public robbery, of which these facts are but a mere specimen. This the reader should always bear in mind. He never should, for one moment, lose sight of this object. He should have it continually before his eyes.—The debate, to which I have alluded, and which I shall give as I find it reported in the news-papers, relates to the treatment received by Mr. Wardle from the House, at the out-set of, and during the investigation.—On the 15th instant, at the opening of the day’s proceeding, LORD FOLKESTONE said: “ I do most sincerely hope, that this House will remember, and that the country will never forget, that my hon. friend (Mr. Wardle), and happy am I in calling him my friend, was not allowed the course of proceeding in this investigation which he had originally determined upon, but was forced into the line of conduct which was recommended, by the personal friend, and professed adviser, of the accused. I believe, upon reference to any

former parliamentary proceedings, or, indeed, upon a review of all the forms and precedents of any judicial inquiry, this case will be found the only one where the person originating the charges was denied to take the course he wished, particularly when that course was neither incompatible with the forms of the tribunal to which he appealed, or inconsistent with the justice that was required. Let the House also recollect, and the country never forget, that my hon. friend (Mr. Wardle) has been pressed day after day, nay, hour after hour, to the prosecution of his charges, without intermission, or even time to prepare the necessary arrangements. Nor has he until within these few days, that I felt it my duty to offer to him my services, had the power of employing any agent to assist him in his arduous but honourable pursuit.—No, on himself alone has depended every exertion to meet the pressing desire on the other side of the House, of proceeding without the slightest relaxation. He has not been able to avail himself of the services of a *Lowten* or a *Wilkinson* to arrange his documents, and to marshal his witnesses. Let the House also recollect, and I hope the country will never forget, that my honourable friend has prosecuted this accusation under an express threat of infamy, contingently attaching to him, a threat virulently and acrimoniously urged (*hear! hear!*) which has been repeated and re-echoed by more than one member in this House, and which up to this moment has never been withdrawn, never rejected, nor even modified. It is under these circumstances, first refused the course of proceeding which he desired, next pressed without intermission, and under the terror of a menace, that my hon. friend has followed up the charges which he has so manfully introduced. These general observations I have thought it necessary to premise, conceiving, as I do, that in the proceedings of this inquiry my hon. friend has not been fairly used.—

[His lordship then came to the business of *Kennet's loan*, and, in stating the difficulties, which he had met with in getting at the papers relating to it, he said that the person who had those papers was afraid of offending the government in bringing them forward. His lordship's words were these]—But the gist of his objection was, that as the defence of the Commander in Chief appeared to be taken up as a ministerial measure, he was apprehensive that he would incur their displeasure, and the displeasure of those immediately under them, which

would probably operate to the ruin of himself and his family. I hear some murmurs of disapprobation from gentlemen in this House, but I do assure them that this is not the only case where similar apprehensions have prevented persons in possession of strong testimony from coming forward, particularly officers in the army, and where information was withheld, from the manner in which it was taken up by the king's servants in that House.—

—Mr. PERCEVAL said, the noble lord had been particularly strenuous in calling on the House, and on the country, to hold the way in which the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle) had been treated in opening this business, and the way in which the noble lord himself had been treated, yesterday, in everlasting remembrance. If so, he (Mr. Perceval) hoped it would also be held in correct remembrance. The noble lord was correct in saying, that it was the anxious wish of gentlemen on that side of the House, out of regard, not to their own feelings only, but to those of the royal Duke, that every thing should be as fair, open, and public as possible. But did it from thence follow, that the mode of proceeding, which had been followed, had been forced on the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle)? Except the noble lord himself there was not a dissentient voice in that House against the mode of proceeding which had been followed. The plan adopted, therefore, was not one pressed on the hon. mover (Mr. Wardle), or on the House, by his hon. friend (Mr. Adam), or himself, but was one on which there was not a contrary opinion, but in one or two instances, in the House. A gentleman behind him had opposed the mode adopted for the very reason, if he at all understood the opinions of the noble lord and the hon. mover of the Inquiry, that they would have supported it, namely, that it was too public a mode of investigation, not, as it was now insinuated, that it was calculated to obstruct public justice. If his memory, however, did not fail him, the hon. gent. himself had not stated, that he wished for a Select Committee, but only for a Committee. The noble lord had indeed proposed a Select Committee; but no reluctance had been shewn by the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle) to the mode of proceeding since adopted. It had not been pressed on him reluctantly, but had been acquiesced in by the unanimous and consentient voice of the House. Was it then fair conduct to be observed towards any member of that House? Was it fair towards the House of Commons itself—that

they should be represented as guilty of harsh, improper, and unparalleled conduct towards the mover of the accusation—or should be held up to the public as impeding, what every one was more anxious than another, to investigate and bring to light? If they were to be tried for such an offence, it was only necessary for their acquittal, that their conduct should be fully known! There never was a case in which more fairness, or a greater desire to afford every assistance in the investigation of truth, manifested itself. It was no wonder, therefore, that his feelings were excited when he heard the conduct of their proceedings so arraigned. He could not forbear, however, referring to one proof of the approbation of the hon. gent. himself (Mr. Wardle) of the whole of the conduct of the cause. During the whole of the proceedings there had not been a single division. Not a single proposition had been insisted on by the hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle), and in which he persevered, which had not been conceded to him, or in the negative to which he had not acquiesced, by waving a decision upon it. The noble lord would not take it amiss that he (Mr. Perceval) declared his conviction, if there was a member of that House who would not acquiesce in any thing of which he did not approve, without pressing the question to the only mean by which its merits could be properly decided on, the noble lord was that person. In addition to the feeling which naturally attended an adherence to what a man thought right, the noble lord would here have had the peculiar pleasure of holding up his boasted minority, however small, to the applause and admiration of the country—a gratification of which he would not willingly have deprived himself, had a favourable opportunity presented itself. The noble lord had also complained that things were not allowed to take their natural course, but that the business had been pressed forward with unbecoming rapidity. He did not recollect any instance of this kind. It was but fair that in so momentous charges, no delay should take place, but the hon. gent. himself could not have forgotten that on one occasion, when one day seemed more convenient to the hon. mover than another, the more remote day, because the more convenient to him, was fixed on. As to the charge of infamy attaching to one party or another,—all that was meant, or had been said, was, not that infamy must attach either to the hon. gent. or to the royal personage; but that, if the

accusations were false, and a conspiracy should be found to exist, infamy would attach to those who had been the cause of stigmatizing his royal highness; and if the gentlemen, who brought forward the accusations, should be found to have too easily lent themselves to an unprincipled conspiracy, that they, would not, by their conduct, have added to their own credit. . . . . [He afterwards spoke as follows, in answer to the last part, above-quoted, of Lord Folkestone's speech.]—The noble lord, however, went too far in stating that there were various instances in which the investigation had been obstructed in this case. He (Mr. Perceval) should not put it to his everlasting recollection, but he put it to his candour, to say what impression such a statement was calculated to make in the public mind? What then would be said, not that there might be charges, which if gone into might implicate the character of the royal person alluded to; but that there was something which prevented the sifting the charges to the bottom, and that many others could be adduced if required. Would it not be equally fair and candid to suppose, as the hon. mover must have felt, that the investigation into some of the charges at least did not support him in his original statement, that those which remained unopened were of this description, and would be found equally defective? He submitted to the noble lord, if it would not be better, before moving for a select Committee, similar to that which had already been appointed, to try what the summons of the House would do, and if he himself could not in the mean time procure inspection of the papers. He was sorry to have delayed the House, but it was impossible for him to have remained silent after what had fallen from the noble lord.—Mr. ADAM said, that it was customary in the House to give to the different members the character which belonged to them: to a baronet the appellation of “the worthy baronet”—to a member of the learned profession that of “the learned gent.” and to the unprofessional members of the House that of “the hon. gent.” It was most irregular and unjust to use any descriptive epithet but such as he had mentioned. He complained, therefore, in the strongest manner of the term “professed adviser of the Duke of York,” used towards himself by the noble lord. If the noble lord had said, that to the suggestion of “a learned gent.” the line of conduct adopted by the House was

owing, he should have had no observation to make; but when it was to go forth to the public that he, a member of Parliament, acted in a Parliamentary proceeding as the *professed adviser* of the Duke of York, he had reason to complain of such an expression, and endeavour if possible to counteract its tendency. He begged the House would excuse his calling their attention to a subject wholly personal; he owned he was actuated by the most serious feelings on this subject. He was anxious in the most solemn manner to repel the imputation which that appellation might cause.—He knew how unpleasant it was to the House to listen to personal observations, but it was important to him that he, whose life had been passed in the discharge of a variety of public duties, should endeavour to preserve the character which he trusted he had acquired without touch or stain. He was not aware that on any occasion he had failed in the discharge of the various obligations which had from time to time been imposed upon him; whether during his Parliamentary life of above twenty-five years, or in the private concerns of his family, exposed as he had been to increasing pressure, to the *res angustie domi*; by which, however, he had never been tempted to deviate from the strict line of political or moral integrity. Although the hon. gent. by whom those charges were originated had intimated that the appointment of a Select Committee to investigate them would accord with his opinion, he had not thought proper to move for such a committee. An hon. gent. opposite had suggested proceeding by a Parliamentary Commission; with those two exceptions, he did not recollect a dissenting voice against the course ultimately adopted by the House. He appealed to the House, whether there had been the least interruption to the most free and unrestrained enquiry. With respect to himself, he was in the judgment of the House, whether he had ever said or done any thing that gave a colour to the appellation of “professed adviser of the Duke of York.” He hoped that the country would be satisfied that this matter, which had been introduced publicly, had been conducted openly, and in a manner that was in the highest degree honourable to the House of Commons.—MR. CALCRAFT blamed the noble lord for the censure which he had chosen to pass on the House, and for the assumption which he had chosen to make in stating that his hon. friend, in the charge which he had brought forward, had been

supported by himself alone. Had that hon. gent. been so deserted as his noble friend described him to be, *he should not have wanted his aid*; but having on a former occasion, upon an inquiry into the conduct of the Medical Board, witnessed that hon. gent.’s ability, he should have thought it highly indecorous had he *thrusted* himself into his councils *unmasked* and *uncalled for*. That hon. gent. had evinced the utmost manliness and delicacy in standing on the ground on which he had chosen to stand, single and unsupported. He had rested his character on the event, and the event would justify him; but it was not becoming any member to *arrogate to himself* peculiar praise on this occasion. The noble lord ought to give credit to others for acting on principles similar to those on which he had himself acted. With respect to the noble lord’s panegyric, he thought he had *read it in some publication*; if not, perhaps he *might yet do so*. He could not, however, but be of opinion, that it would have proceeded with more propriety from any other lips than his own.”

This is a debate full of interest. We will go backwards in our remarks, because Mr. Calcraft’s charge against lord Folkestone is of a sort to demand immediate comment. What *arrogance* did his lordship discover? How did he pronounce a panegyric on himself, in stating, that, until within a few days, Mr. Wardle had received no assistance from any member out of the 658, and that all he had now received, *out of doors* (for such was the manifest meaning) was what little he, lord Folkestone, had been able to give him? Was it not the well-known *truth*, and was it not necessary to state that truth, in a manner that it might be imprinted upon the minds of the injured and insulted people? That it was *out of doors* that his lordship meant is certain, because he says, that Mr. Wardle has had no “*agent*” to assist him; and, then, he goes on to say, that Mr. Wardle has not had the assistance of “the services of a *Lawten*, or a *Wilkinson*, “to arrange his documents, and to mark “shal his witnesses.”—It is true, notoriously true, and is universally seen and acknowledged, that, since Sir Francis Burdett was disabled by the gout from attending the House, lord Folkestone has been the only man, who has actually appeared as an *assistant* of Mr. Wardle.—As to the panegyric that Mr. Calcraft has read, or expects to read, upon the noble lord,

in some publication, he may be disappointed, for the conduct of his lordship needs none; nor is there any pen that can do justice to the subject. Mr. Calcraft was safe, here, in one respect; for there was no fear of *retaliation* on the part of his lordship.—One thing, respecting lord Folkestone, however, I must state, and that is, when the late ministry (under whom Mr. Calcraft had a fat post) came into power, they offered his lordship a place of fifteen hundred pounds a year, of which he declined to accept; though, it will be remembered by most men acquainted with politics, that he all along, except upon particular occasions, continued to support them. There is no man, who knows my lord Folkestone, who is acquainted with that steady adherence to truth and to principle which is innate in him, and with that modesty, which is so prominent a part of his character, with his fidelity to his word and to his friends; there is no man, who is at all acquainted with his character, who will ever believe, that he has, upon this occasion, acted from any other motive than that of a conviction that his duty required him to do what he has done.—Oh, oh! It seems, then, that there were many members ready and willing to assist Mr. Wardle *from the first*, had they not been convinced, that so great were his own individual powers, he wanted no assistance; and even *Mr. Calcraft himself*, would have tendered the use of his abilities, had he not entertained this conviction. Come, this is some comfort. But, if I mistake not, at the first opening of the business, there was only Sir Francis Burdett (who seconded Mr. Wardle's motion), and my lord Folkestone, from whom Mr. Wardle received even the smallest degree of countenance. And when, at a later period, the charge about Captain Maling, owing to a mere error in words, *appeared to have failed*; at this period, if I mistake not, the party, to which Mr. Calcraft belongs, did, in a most formal and solemn manner, *disclaim all connection with Mr. Wardle*, with respect to these charges, and that one of that party did distinctly say, that he had sent a message to him *not to bring forward the charges*, adding, that he had been *imposed upon* by the actors in a *foul conspiracy* against the Duke. That this was the case the public well knows; and, therefore, this declaration, that there were many members ready and willing to assist him, had they not been convinced that his own abilities rendered their assistance unnecessary, comes a little too late in

point of fact, and a little too soon in point of time; because the formal and solemn disclaimer is still fresh in the memory of every man, who is not an ideot.—Now, as to the phrase, which appears to have given so much offence to Mr. Adam, Lord Folkestone says, that he by no means meant it in the way of reproach; and, I must think, that the reader will agree with me, that, when Mr. Adam's first speech upon the subject is recollectcd; when it is recollectcd, what he said about the 20 years that the pecuniary affairs of the Duke had been in his hands, and about the unreserved communication between them; when it is recollectcd, that he then took upon himself to say, that the charges would prove unfounded; when it is recollectcd, that he has since held (as he acknowledges) conferences and consultations with the Duke and Colonel Gordon and Mr. Perceval, relative to matters connected with the inquiry; that he has had a witness, if not witnesses, in favour of the Duke, sent to him, who put questions to them, previous to their coming to be examined by the House; that (as he acknowledges) he was apprized of similar previous examinations going on at Mr. Lowten's office; and, finally, that he was consulted and did advise relative to the time and manner of producing the circumstance of the pretended forgery: when all this is recollectcd, was there any thing unjust, any thing harsh, any thing overstrained, in lord Folkestone's calling Mr. Adam the “*professed adviser of the Duke of York?*” Besides, observe the occasion on which the phrase was used. It was in reference to the *mode* of inquiry, and bore, upon the face of it, a proof, that it was not meant to convey to the world an idea, that Mr. Adam had, while a member of the House, while a *judge* in the case, acted, at the same time, as the *advocate* of the Duke. There was nothing in the words to convey such a meaning; and, therefore, it does seem strange to me, that Mr. Adam should have felt so sore upon the subject.—I shall, hereafter, endeavour to give a fair view of *Mr. Adam's case*, who, at present, certainly does not stand so well with the public as I could most sincerely wish; and I cannot refrain from observing now, that, we must be involved with such people, by slow degrees, as Mr. Adam appears to have been; we must be exposed to the solicitations of the all-powerful; we must experience their opportunities and feel the weight of influence, pressing from so many quarters,

before we can say, that we should not have acted as Mr. Adam has acted. All that he says, respecting his general character and conduct, is, I am convinced, perfectly true. It was *integrity*, and not *sycophancy*, that recommended Mr. Adam to the selection of the Duke of York, because the repair of dilapidated affairs wanted integrity; but, it does not follow, that, because I choose such a man to husband my means, on the one hand, I should not profligately waste them, on the other; or, that I should be at all the more scrupulous in the way of providing for my pleasures.—But, it is now time to come to the *complaint* contained in Lord Folkestone's speech.—And, is it not true, that the *mode of proceeding*, pointed out by Mr. Wardle, the maker of the charges, was *not adopted*? Is it not true, that this is *quite novel* in the history of parliament? Was not the mode Mr. Wardle proposed overruled? Did not the House refuse him that mode, which he wished to be adopted? Is not all this well known to the people, and ought not the people to hold it in everlasting remembrance? Mr. Wardle, we are told by Mr. Perceval, *did not object* to the setting aside of his proposed mode of inquiry; there was no *division of the House* upon the question. Very true; but, did not Mr. Wardle clearly see, what must have been the result of such an objection, or such a division? As it *has happened*, the mode which has been adopted is more advantageous to the public, than the mode proposed by Mr. Wardle would have been; and, I must confess, that, morally certain that what has come out, would come out, I was glad to see the examination at bar determined on. But, still, Mr. Wardle's mode *was overruled*; and this being something, as lord Folkestone says, unprecedented in the history of the parliament, it was, and is, just ground of complaint, on the part of Mr. Wardle, who, it cannot be denied, did meet, at the very out-set, with a hostile reception. What other construction can possibly be put upon the out-cry about "*a jacobin conspiracy*," and "*the libellous-ness of the press?*" Mr. Wardle comes and says; "I accuse the Duke of York of *this and of that?*" What is the answer? why, that there has long existed a *conspiracy*, of which the public writers form a part, to write and talk down the Duke of York, the army, the church, and the monarchial branch of the constitution. This was the answer to Mr. Wardle, from the servants of the king and their supporters;

and, from the other side, in a few days after, it was flatly stated, that Mr. Wardle had been *imposed upon by a foul conspiracy*. Was not this giving him a hostile reception?—Then, as to *pushing him on*; and leaving no time for search, or for reflection; is it not fresh in the recollection of the public; is it not written in the reports of the debates, that he was pushed on? And that, when Mr. Wardle complained of this, and wished for a day or two to look about him and to think, was it not represented as unjust, and was he not asked: "Is it to be endured, that charges like these shall hang, from day to day, suspended over the head of a son of the crown?" When lord Folkestone, upon one occasion, stated the exhausted condition of Mr. Wardle himself, was he not silenced by the cry of "*go on, go on?*" To say, as Mr. Perceval does, in answer to lord Folkestone, that there have been no *divisions* in the House, upon any of these points; good Lord! what is it! what does that circumstance make against the fact?—The other complaint of lord Folkestone is, that Mr. Wardle had proceeded with the threat of *infamy* contingently attached to him, and that this threat had neither been withdrawn nor modified up to the present moment.—In answer to this Mr. Perceval says, that: "all that was meant, or *had been said*, was, *not that infamy must attach either to Mr. Wardle or the Duke*; but that, if the *accusation were false, and a conspiracy should be found to exist, infamy would attach to the conspirators*, and that if the gentlemen who brought forward the accusations, should be found to have too easily lent themselves to an unprincipled conspiracy, they would not, by their conduct, have added to their own credit."—Oh, dear me! Lack-a-day! Here are an abundance of very nice qualifications, not one word of which was to be seen, in *any one* of the reports of the famous debate, the ever-memorable debate, the everlastingly-to-be esteemed and preserved debate, of Friday the 27th day of January in the year 1809. In the report of that debate, there appeared these words, as uttered by Mr. Canning, the king's secretary of state for foreign affairs: "The hon. gent. (Mr. Wardle) surely must be aware, that having undertaken the responsible task of submitting to a British House of Commons such a serious accusation, whatever may be the result of its deliberation; in whatever view the House shall consider the transactions which he has disclosed,

" whether they be refuted or substantiated, *infamy* must attach somewhere, either upon the ACCUSED or the ACCUSER."—These were the words, and these words, lord Folkestone now, in the face of the House, after Mr. Perceval's speech, asserts to have been used, and no one contradicts him; therefore, we must conclude, that the reports of the several news-papers, which all agree as to these words in particular, were correct. That, by ACCUSER, Mr. Canning *might* mean the "conspiracy" is certain; but, taking in the former part, the "*responsible*" part of the sentence, there is room to believe that he might, and did, mean Mr. Wardle; and, by the ACCUSED, it is utterly impossible, that he could mean any other person than the Duke of York.—Mr. Perceval, when, in the close of this part of his speech, he complains of lord Folkestone's saying, that the inquiry had manifestly suffered from the fear of people capable of giving information, that their doing so might offend the government; when Mr. Perceval thus complains, and says, that such a statement is calculated to create unfounded *suspicions* in the country, he appears to have forgotten, that his lordship has spoken of *a fact*; that he had stated, that he himself had applied to a person to give up certain papers; that this person was unwilling to give them up; "that the jet of his objection was, "that, as the defence of the Duke had been taken up as a ministerial measure, he was apprehensive that he would incur their displeasure, and the displeasure of those immediately under them, which would probably operate to the ruin of himself and family." To this his lordship added: "I do assure the House, that this is not the only instance where similar apprehensions have prevented persons in possession of strong testimony, from coming forward, particularly officers in the army, and where information was withheld from the manner in which the thing had been taken up by the king's servants in that House." And, is not this very natural? Was there any need of the positive fact, stated by lord Folkestone, to make the country believe this? Is there one man amongst us, who would not have anticipated what lord Folkestone expressed? When the ministers and their friends began, when they received the charges, with denouncing as *conspirators* all those, who had wrote and talked against the Duke of York, was it not to be expected, that all those persons, who were, in any

way, dependant upon the government, would, if they possessed information upon the subject, take special care not to let it be known? And would not this, in a particular manner, apply to officers in the army, whose sole means of preserving their rank in life, and even of obtaining bread, depended upon the ministry, including that very person, against whom the charges were preferred? A conclusion so obvious could have escaped no man with unaduled brains in his head.—It is useless to endeavour to stop the spreading of this way of thinking. It has, long ago, reached every soul in the country. The mind of the country is completely settled as to this point; and, indeed, upon the whole of the proceeding; all that is now necessary to be done being to place the facts upon record, in a way that they may be with facility referred to.—The diversions, in Spain and Portugal, will be of little avail. There is nobody that cares, or need care, a straw about them. The interesting scene is *at home*, where the taxes are laid and collected. To this scene the people's eyes, after twenty-four years of blindness, are, at last, open; and, though it is possible, that they may be induced to wink for a while, all the arts in the world will never be able to blind them again.—This is good. It is a great thing done. It is a firm step gained in the way of national restoration; and, for this great good, we have to thank, and the whole of the uncorrupt part of the nation most heartily do thank, MR. WARDLE.

*Botley, Thursday, 23rd Feb. 1809.*

---

The following Letter, published in the Morning Chronicle of the 20th instant, complains of a mis-statement in my paper of last week. The mis-statement is not mine. The name of Dr. Glasse was mentioned in the evidence; but, I very gladly give the correction; and should be still more glad to be able, consistently with truth and impartiality, to expunge also, from these scandalous disclosures, the name of Mr. Glasse, his son, who, upon my return to England, was one of the first persons to shew me kindness; who, as often as the occasion has occurred, has uniformly shown towards me the same disposition; whom I never had the smallest reason to suspect capable of meanness of any sort; but whom, on the contrary, I had every reason to regard as an upright and generous man.

"Sir,—I had no design to notice the introduction of my name into the transac-

tions now before the public (in a manner equally painful and astonishing to myself,) otherwise than by making to my private and personal friends, the solemn asseveration of my ignorance as to the steps taken with a view to serve me, by mis-guided zeal and erring gratitude; accompanied by such proof as the nature of the case admits.

—But the pride of conscious innocence will not allow me to be silent, when I observe in several of the papers, and particularly in The Political Register of yesterday, the name of my honoured father confusedly blended with my own. It is to shield his fair fame from the possibility of censure, that I thus address you, Sir, requesting you to give the utmost publicity, to the declaration, "that the introduction "of Dr. Glasse's name into these miserable "discussions is totally and altogether "founded in error." To those who are acquainted with the tenor of Dr. Glasse's life during a ministry of more than fifty years, this avowal may be unnecessary; it would, however, be unjust, that an idea to his prejudice should even accidentally be imprinted on the mind of a stranger. By my own conduct, as far as honesty of intention goes, I am ready to stand or fall; and on that ground I am little affected even by the attacks of calumny; but I confess myself unequal to enduring the thought, that the closing hours of a blameless and venerable man should be imbibited by imputations abhorrent from his character; or that he should be implicated in a charge, against which every feeling of his soul would not fail to revolt. I am, Sir,—Your obedient humble servant,

GEORGE HENRY GLASSE."

*Rectory House, Hanwell,*

*Feb. 19, 1809.*

### COBBETT'S COMPLETE COLLECTION OF

### State Trials:

To be completed in Thirty-Six Monthly Parts, forming Twelve large Volumes in Royal Octavo.

The THIRD PART of the above Work will be published on Wednesday, the first of March. One Part will appear, with the greatest regularity, on the first of each succeeding Month. Those Subscribers who have expressed their intention of taking the Work in Quarterly Volumes, are respectfully informed that the First Volume will be ready for delivery on the same day.

### COBBETT'S Parliamentary Debates:

The TWELFTH VOLUME is in the Press. All Communications for the above Work, if sent to the Publishers in due time, shall be carefully attended to.

### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Twenty-fifth Bulletin of the French Army of Spain, dated Benevente, Jan. 5.*

His Majesty being informed that the English army was reduced to less than 20,000 men, resolved upon moving his head-quarters from Astorga to Benevente, where he will remain some days, and from whence he will proceed to take a central position at Valladolid, leaving to the duke of Dalmatia the task of destroying the English army.—His Majesty, on being informed that in the places where the prisoners were collected, and where there are ten Spaniards for one Englishman, the Spaniards ill-used and plundered the English, gave orders for separating the English from the Spaniards, and for observing towards the former a particular sort of treatment.—The rear-guard of the English, by accepting battle at Prievas, had hoped to enable the left column, which was chiefly composed of Spaniards, to form its junction at Villa Franca. He also hoped to gain a night, in order more completely to evacuate Villa Franca. We found in the hospital at Villa Franca 300 English sick or wounded. The English burnt in that town a large magazine of flour and corn. They also destroyed several artillery carriages, and killed 500 of their horses. We have already counted 1600 of them left dead on the roads. The amount of the prisoners is considerable, and increases every moment. In the cellars of the town we found several English soldiers who had died from drunkenness.—The head of Merle's division, forming part of the duke of Dalmatia's corps, came up with the advanced guard on the 3rd. At four p. m. it reached the rear-guard of the English, who were upon the heights of Prievas, a league before Villa Franca, consisting of 5000 infantry and 600 cavalry. This position was a very fine position, and difficult to attack. Gen. Merle made his dispositions. The infantry advanced, beat the charge, and the English were entirely routed. The difficulty of the ground did not permit the cavalry to charge, and only 200 prisoners were taken. We had some 50 men killed or

wounded. Gen. Colbert advanced to see if the cavalry could form; his hour was arrived, a ball struck him in the forehead, and he lived but a quarter of an hour. There are two roads from Astorga to Villa Franca. The English took the right, the Spaniards the left; they marched without order, were cut off and surrounded by the Hanoverian Chasseurs. A general of brigade and a whole division laid down their arms.—The head-quarters of the duke of Dalmatia were, on the 4th in the evening, at the distance of ten leagues from Lugo. On the 2nd his Majesty reviewed at Astorga the divisions of Laborde and Loison, which form the army of Portugal. These troops see the English flying, and burn with impatience to get up with them.—His Majesty left as a reserve at Astorga, the corps of the duke of Elchingen, who has had his advanced guard on the passes into Gallicia, and who is enabled in case of emergency, to support the corps of the duke of Dalmatia.—Since the 27th ult. we have taken more than 10,000 prisoners, among whom are 1,500 English. We have taken also more than 400 baggage waggons, 15 waggons of firelocks, their magazines, and hospitals. The English retreat in disorder, leaving magazines, sick, wounded, and equipage. They will experience a still greater loss, and if they be able to embark, it is probable it will not be without the loss of half their army. But informed that the army was reduced below 20,000 men, resolved to remove his head-quarters from Astorga to Benevente. We found in the barns several English who had been hanged by the Spaniards; his Majesty was indignant and ordered the barns to be burnt; the peasants, whatever may be their resentment, have no right to attempt the lives of the waggoners of either army. His Majesty has ordered the English prisoners to be treated with all the respect due to soldiers who have manifested liberal ideas, and sentiments of honour. On the 4th, at night, the duke of Dalmatia's head-quarters were ten leagues from Lugo.—Gov. De St. Cyr's division entered Barcelona on the 17th. On the 15th he came up with generals Reding's and Vives's troops at Lieras, and completely routed them. He took six pieces of cannon, 30 waggons, and 3000 men.—We have received the confirmation of the news announcing the arrival of the 7th corps, under gen. Gouvier St. Cyr, at Barcelona. He entered that place on the 17th. On the 15th, he fell in with the troops commanded by generals Reding

and Vives, and completely dispersed them. He took from them six pieces of cannon, 30 caissons, and 3000 men. By means of the junction of the 7th corps with the troops under general Duhesme, we have a large army at Barcelona.—When his Majesty was at Tordesillas, he had his head quarters in the outward buildings of the royal convent of St. Claire. It was to this convent that the mother of Charles V. had retired, and where she died. The convent of St. Claire was built on the scite of a Moorish palace, of which about two halls remain in fine preservation. The abbess was presented to the Emperor. She is 75 years of age, and for 65 years she had not gone out of her cloisters. She was considerably moved when she passed the threshold; but she conversed with the Emperor with much presence of mind, and obtained several favours for her friends.

*Intercepted Letter to the Marquis De Romana:*

“Sir,—I should not have detained your instructions so long, had not sir John Moore returned very late to Villa Franca. He arrived greatly fatigued. I delivered your letter to him, to which he cannot return an answer till to-morrow; but he desired me to inform you, that he would set out at an early hour. There are at Benevente, 2 or 300 of the French cavalry, who annoy our stragglers between Benevente and Villa Franca. General Moore begs you will place a battalion on the heights over the road, where they may fire on them without any risk.—There is no news. We know nothing of the movements of the French, and we continue to retreat. I am not certain that sir J. Moore will allow me to return to your excellency. In that case, permit me to express an hope of meeting with you in London, in better times; for be assured, sir, I retain a grateful recollection of your kindness, and am with the greatest respect, &c. M. LYMER.”

Villa Franca, Jan. 2, 1809.

*Twenty-Sixth Bulletin, dated, Valladolid, January 7.*

After gen. Gouvier de St. Cyr entered Barcelona, he proceeded to the Lobregat, and forced the enemy's intrenched camp, and took 25 pieces of cannon. He then took Tarragona, a place of great importance.—The annexed Reports of generals Duhesme and St. Cyr, contain the details of the military events that have taken place in Catalonia to the 21st of December. They do the greatest credit to gen. St. Cyr. Every thing that has taken place at Bar-

celona is to the praise of gen. Duhesme, who has displayed great talents and firmness.—The troops of the kingdom of Italy have covered themselves with glory; their excellent conduct has sensibly affected the Emperor. They are in truth chiefly composed of the corps formed by his Majesty in the campaign of the year five. The Italian picked men are as wise as they are brave; they have given rise to no complaint, and have shewed the greatest courage. Since the time of the Romans, the people of Italy had not made war in Spain. Since the Romans, no epoch has been so glorious for the Italian arms.—The army of the kingdom of Italy is already 80,000 strong, and good soldiers. These are the guarantees which that fine country has of being no longer the theatre of war. His Majesty has removed his head-quarters from Benevento to Valladolid: He received to-day all the constituted authorities.—Ten of the worst of the lowest ranks have been put to death. They are the same who massacred gen. Cevallos, and who for so long a time have oppressed the better sort of people.—His Majesty has ordered the suppression of the Dominican convent, in which one Frenchman was killed. He testified his satisfaction at the convent of San Penete, whose monks are enlightened men, who, far from having preached war and disorder, of having shewn themselves greedy of blood and murder, have employed all their cares and efforts to calm the people and bring them back to good order. Several Frenchmen owe their lives to them. The Emperor wished to see these religious men; and, when he was informed they were Benedictines, whose members have always rendered themselves illustrious in literature and sciences, both in France and in Italy, he condescended to express the satisfaction he felt at owing this obligation to them. In general the clergy of this city are good—The monks who are really dangerous are the fanatic Dominicans, who had got possession of the inquisition, and who having bathed their hands in the blood of a Frenchman, had the sacrilegious cowardice to swear on the Gospel that the unfortunate man who was demanded of them was not dead, and had been carried to the hospital, and who afterwards owned, that after he had been killed he was thrown into a well where he had been found: Barbarians and hypocrites, who preach intolerance

france, excite discord and blood, you are not the ministers of the Gospel! The period when Europe beheld, without indignation, the massacre of Protestants celebrated by illuminations in great cities can never be revived: The blessings of toleration are the first rights of man; it is the first maxim of the Gospel, because it is the first attribute of charity. If there was a time when some false teachers of the Christian religion preached intolerance, they had not then in view the interest of heaven, but those of their temporal influence; they wished to be powerful amongst ignorant people. When a monk, a theologian, a bishop, a pope, preaches intolerance, he preaches his own condemnation; he gives himself up to be the laughing-stock of nations.—The duke of Dalmatia will be to-night at Lugo. Numerous columns of prisoners are on their march thither.—Gen. Davenoy proceeded with 500 cavalry to Toro. He came up with two or 300 men, the remains of the insurrection. He charged them, and killed or took the greater part. The colonel of the Dutch hussars was wounded in the charge.

*Twenty-seventh Bulletin, dated Valladolid,  
Jan. 9.*

The duke of Dalmatia, after the battle of Prievas, proceeded to expel the English from the post of Piedra Fella. He there took 1500 English prisoners, five pieces of cannon, and several caissons. The enemy was obliged to destroy a quantity of baggage and stores. The precipices were filled with them. Such was their precipitate flight and confusion, that the divisions of Lorge and Lahoussaye found among the deserted baggage, waggon filled with gold and silver; it was part of the treasure of the English army. The property fallen into our hands is estimated at two millions—On the 4th, at night, the French advanced guard was at Castillo and Nocedo. On the 5th, the enemy's rear-guard was come up with at Pueste and Ferren, the moment it was going to blow up a bridge, a charge of cavalry rendered the attempt useless.—It was the same at the bridge of Cruciel.—On the 5th, at night, Lorge and Lahoussaye's division were at Constantine, and the enemy a short distance from Lugo. On the 6th the duke of Dalmatia was on his march to reach that city.— (To be continued.)

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 9.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1809.

[Price 10d.

"A cowardice, too, of the *basest* kind, participating of the most depraved and odious qualities, deserving of that execration which the best feelings of humanity would pronounce on the *base assailant of female weakness*!"—Mr. CANNING, in the Debate of 27th Jan. 1809.

321]

[322

## DUKE OF YORK.

(Continued from page 314.)

BEFORE I proceed with my Analysis of the cases, I shall offer some observations, upon the *Letter*, with which the Duke of York has treated the House of Commons and the public; but, previous even to those observations I feel myself called upon to notice the re-examination of *Miss Taylor*, who, as the reader will recollect, was a principal witness in the case of French and Sandon's levy, and whose testimony, he will also recollect, remained unshaken, up to that part inclusive, which was wrought into the analysis of the case, in my last number.—This re-examination appears to have arisen from a man of the name of *Frederick Schmidt*, or *Smith*, having given information to some one, that *Miss Taylor's father* was, at one time, called *Chance*; and, from a discovery, which had been made, that she was not a legitimate child; that her father and mother were not married. I shall now give this re-examination as I find it reported, including the intervening observations of the several members, who spoke upon it.

By MR. BRADSHAW.

Do you recollect your paternal grandfather?—I do not, he was dead before I was born.

Might not your father have taken the name of *CHANCE* without your knowledge, and from pecuniary embarrassments?—How then should I know it.

By MR. PERCEVAL.

Is your father alive?—He is.

Has not your mother been confined under an execution for debt in the Fleet prison? [The witness, much agitated, drew back from the bar, with these expressions—“*My mother's misfortunes have nothing to do with the object of the present Inquiry.*”]

Has not your mother been in custody for debt?

Witness. I appeal to the protection of the Chair.

MR. WHARTON. “It is my duty to call

upon you for an answer to the last question.”

After some moments the witness, in tears, replied—Yes.

How long was she confined?—Two years.

The witness was ordered to withdraw.

MR. PERCEVAL stated that gentlemen opposite, when ready to depreciate his mode of examination, appeared to forget that the witness had represented herself, in her former examination, as the *legitimate daughter of married parents*, although it was now clear, by the imprisonment of her mother, that she never was married to the father of *Miss Taylor*.

MR. W. SMITH did dislike the tenor of the examination which was followed by the opposite side. It had in the previous part a tendency to cast imputations upon the character of the witness herself; but, *that having failed, her veracity was to be questioned*, because she had the misfortune to be the offspring of an illicit connexion. Her delicacy in endeavouring to conceal that circumstance, in his opinion, instead of weakening, strengthened her yet unshaken claims to credit.

MR. WHITBREAD considered the question for the decision of the Committee was not, whether *Miss Taylor's birth* was respectable, but whether her testimony was credible? Besides, he believed the Chancellor of the Exchequer had assumed more than the evidence would justify, when he asserted that *Miss Taylor* had represented herself to the Committee as the daughter of *married parents*.—Her former evidence was then read, and it appeared that no such statement was made by her.

SIR JOHN SERBRIGT declared, that the impression which the first answer of the witness, on her former examination, namely, that she was the *daughter of a gentleman*, made on his mind, was, that she was an illegitimate child.

MR. W. WYNNE said; it was not to be endured, that because, from an amiable reluctance, the explanation of the witness

did not run before decorum and sensibility, that, therefore, a suspicion was to be entertained of her veracity.

. MR. BARHAM. Really this is an attempt to discredit a correct witness, not upon her own testimony, but upon the errors of her parents.

Frederick Shnidt, upon being examined and cross-examined, gave no testimony, that Miss Taylor ever knew that her father went, upon any occasion, by the name of Chance; so that, there was nothing now came out, which did not tend to confirm, rather than to weaken, her former claims to credibility. In her former evidence, she did *not* say that she was a legitimate child; she did *not* say, that her father and mother were married; but, suppose she had said so; good God! would that have impeached her general veracity? Because she, whose very bread depended so much upon the character of her connections; who had a sister keeping a boarding-school, in partnership with herself; who had two brothers in the naval and three in the military service, all bearing commissions; was her general veracity to be impeached, because she did not state, because she disguised, a fact not at all connected with the matter upon which she was examined, and a fact, the proclaiming of which must, at once, greatly injure, not only herself, but her father, mother, sister, and brothers?—It is but justice to the House of Commons to say, that they do appear to have received, with great applause, the sentiments of Mr. Smith, Mr. Whitbread, Sir J. Sebright, Mr. Wyne and Mr. Barham; and, in this respect, at least, the voice of the country is decidedly with that of the House. There is but one sentiment upon this subject. The treatment of Miss Taylor is in the mouth of every person, who talks upon matters connected with the inquiry. The press, with the sole exception, I believe, of the *Nabobs' Gazette*, has been unanimous in endeavours to do her justice; and, I do hope, that, when the affair is all over, if she shall still be found to have adhered to the truth, the public will consider the ruin, to which she has been exposed, and will yield her other protection than that which is given by words; for, as far as I am able to judge, an object more worthy of compassion and of support never presented itself to the people of this kingdom, who, whatever faults they may have, do not number amongst them that of a want of compassion, or of justice towards the injured.

The Letter of the Duke of York, to the House of Commons, we must first insert. It is a document of a very curious nature, and the proceedings upon it must, and will, be, in the end, of the greatest consequence to the country.—“ To the Speaker of the House of Commons.—“ Horse Guards, February 23rd, 1809.—“ Sir, I have waited with the greatest anxiety until the Committee appointed by the House of Commons to inquire into my conduct, as Commander in Chief of his Majesty's Army, had closed its examinations, and I now hope that it will not be deemed improper to address this letter, through you, to the House of Commons.—I observe with the deepest concern, that in the course of this inquiry, my name has been coupled with transactions the most criminal and disgraceful, and I must ever regret and lament, that a connection should ever have existed, which has thus exposed my character and honour to public animadversion.—With respect to my alledged offences, connected with the discharge of my official duties, I do, in the most solemn manner, upon my honour, as a prince, distinctly assert my innocence, not only by denying all corrupt participation in any of the infamous transactions which have appeared in evidence at the bar of the House of Commons, or any connivance at their existence, but also the slightest knowledge or suspicion that they existed at all.—My consciousness of innocence leads me confidently to hope, that the House of Commons will not, upon such evidence as they have heard, adopt any proceeding prejudicial to my honour and character; but if, on such testimony as has been adduced against me, the House of Commons can think my innocence questionable, I claim of their justice, that I shall not be condemned without trial, or be deprived of the benefit and protection which is afforded to every British subject, by those sanctions under which alone evidence is received in the ordinary administration of the law.—I am, Sir, your's, &c.—FREDERICK.”—Now, I will venture to assert, that, of the fourteen millions of people, of which this nation consists, there is not one, except those who are the advisers of the Duke of York, who would have expected, under such circumstances, such a letter from him. It really would appear, that he looks upon the evidence that has been given against him as being discredited, not

only by the House, but by the country ; and, that his simple denial, upon his “*honour now, as a prince,*” is quite sufficient to do away the effect of all that has passed in the House of Commons, within the last interesting month. Here we have a most striking instance of the blinding effects of long-enjoyed power, and long-continued flattery. A person, so circumstanced, does not see with the eyes, or hear with the ears, of men whom no one has an interest in deceiving. Blessed advisers he must have, who, while such a mass of positive and corroborated and strongly presumptive evidence lay against him, took up his pen to give it a simple negation, upon his bare word ; who, in the face of his two letters, wherein Clavering’s application is mentioned, and wherein, in consequence of a request of Mrs. Clarke, it is stated that he will endeavour to procure O’Meara an opportunity of preaching before royalty ; who, in the face of these letters, tells the House of Commons, that he never had “*the slightest knowledge or suspicion,*” that these corruptions existed at all. Blessed advisers that man must have, especially after the inquiry into the origin of the short note respecting Tonyn’s promotion, and which note does, at last, set at defiance all the attempts to make it out “*a forgery.*” Blessed advisers, to say, in the face of all this, that he never had even a *suspicion* that such things existed ; and to appear *confident*, that, in consequence of this bare assertion, upon “*the honour of a prince,*” the House of Commons should, with their month’s examinations of witnesses before them, stop short, in a moment ; or, at least, that they should come to no decision, upon that evidence, prejudicial to his honour and character ! Blessed advisers that man must have !—Why, upon reading this assertion, as opposed to the evidence taken at the bar of the House, the observation that starts from every mouth, is this : “ Oh ! “ then, why was there *any inquiry at all ?* “ If the Duke’s assertion, upon his *honour as a prince*, be sufficient to knock down “ all this evidence, why not have appealed “ to that word, when Mr. Wardle brought “ forward his charges ? And why not “ have brought the Duke’s denial ; the “ Duke’s “ *distinct assertion,*” to set “ against Mr. Wardle and his charges, “ and thereupon, voted the charges to be “ false and malicious, and the work of a “ jacobinical conspiracy against the “ ill-“ lustrious House of Brunswick ? ”—But, it has been contended, that there is

nothing, in this letter, trenching upon the *privileges* of the House ; no attempt to deter them from proceeding, in their own way, with respect to the charges and evidence against the Duke. Mr. Whitbread, on the day after the letter had been read to the House, spoke of it as an attack upon its privileges, and observed, that the Duke might as well have written a letter to the House *before any proceedings had taken place*, asserting his innocence, and suggesting, that they ought not to proceed.—Mr. Perceval denied this, and said, that the Duke *merely asserted* his innocence, and *requested* that, should that innocence still be doubted, he might be allowed to go to trial, without any further *previous proceedings against him* ; and that he (Mr. Perceval) saw nothing unconstitutional or improper in this.—No ? Well said, Mr. Perceval ! It may be “*constitutional*,” for that is a very accommodating word ; and, it may be “*proper*” too ; but, if the letter has any meaning at all in it, it is this ; that the House will *do wrong*, that they will be guilty of an act of injustice, if they take *any step* in the business, *prejudicial* to the Duke ; and, that, at most, they ought to leave his conduct to be judged of by others than themselves. This, indeed, is admitted by Mr. Perceval ; it cannot be denied ; and, if this be not dictating to the House what they ought, or rather, what they ought not, to do, I know not the meaning of the word *dictate*. There may have been letters, sent, by accused persons, to the House of Commons ; but, I defy Mr. Perceval to produce an instance of such a letter as this ; a letter, expressing a “*confident hope,*” that the House, who have taken evidence upon the case, will not, to the *prejudice* of the accused, proceed to any step, grounded upon that evidence.—Then, observe, the whole of the evidence, taken by the House, and many parts of which great numbers of the members have expressly declared to be unshaken ; the whole of this evidence, in a lump, not excepting even that contained in his own letters and note, is branded as false by the party accused. He presumes, before the summing up has taken place in the House, to tell them how they ought to decide upon the quality of the evidence ; he, upon his bare word, and without pretending to possess the means of *proving* what he says, takes upon him to tell the House, that they ought to regard as a liar every person, who has given evidence against him.—Nay, he further presumes to say, that, if the House

can believe the accusatory evidence; if they can think his innocence *questionable*; what then? What is then contingently pointed out to them? Why, to leave him to be tried elsewhere; and, in the meanwhile, not to adopt *any* proceeding, prejudicial to his honour and character. Now, it will be recollect'd, that, in other cases of impeachment, the House have, the moment they found *cause* for impeachment, addressed the king to remove the accused persons from his councils and presence, and especially from any places of *trust*, or *command*, that they possessed at the time; all, or any one, of which, the Duke has now the modesty to "confidently hope," that they will not attempt to do, in this his particular case, notwithstanding all the evidence that they have before them; and this "confident hope" he expresses, too, at the same time, that he talks so fluently of the protection afforded to *every other* British subject!—That, upon this occasion, all possible delicacy towards the king should be shown, I am quite willing to allow. It is enough in all conscience for a father to know that such grounds of charge exist against his son, without being told any thing about them in a harsh manner. An address for removal from his presence for ever, or at all, would sound hard; but, from *employment* and *councils*, until a final decision take place, is what reason, is what the necessity of the case points out. Indeed, what must those advisers be, who would render even this necessary? Perhaps they will not. To *lay the evidence before the king* seems to be the first step; and then to wait to see, whether any further step be required.—One cannot, however, make these observations, without suffering to intrude the reflection of how dangerous it is to place members of the royal family in *responsible* situations. It is true, that, in the eye of the law, the Duke of York is no more than a *subject* of the king; but, let law, and even philosophy, say what they will, the practice will set their maxims and their principles at defiance.—Reader, has it not struck you as a question to be asked, How the Duke, who appears to be so full of that "conscious innocence," of which the Nabobs' Gazette speaks, came to think it necessary; how he, who so boldly asserts his innocence, and who seems to hold the evidence against him in such hearty contempt; how he came to think it at all necessary to tell the House, that he hoped they would not adopt any proceeding *prejudicial to his honour*? Why should he sup-

pose they would? How came such a thought into that head of his? It seems to me, that if I had been in his place, and conscious of innocence and contemning the evidence against me, I should have let my judges alone to acquit me, in their own good time and manner. If, indeed, I have *evidence* on my side to produce; then, I say, "wait; hear me too, before you decide;" but, the Duke has produced all his evidence. A whole *levy*, an army, of lawyers and attorneys have been at work for him, during the whole of the proceedings, which, at last, closed with the examination of General Officers (*members of the House, too*) as to his talents and industry in the *disciplining* of the army. He does not ask to be heard; he does not even pretend that he has any thing to produce in his defence; he merely brands all the evidence against him as *falshoods*, and, as the *COURIER* (which has acted a most *manly* part in these times) well observes, "desires complete acquittal without producing any *evidence* other than mere assertion!"—Well, but how came he to think an expression of his "confident hope" necessary? It is not, I think, too much to presume, that the answer to this question must be to this amount, namely, *that he thought it probable, at the least, that the House looked upon the evidence in a light different from that, in which he viewed it*; for, unless he thus thought, it is evident, that he would not have written a letter, containing words expressive of such a hope; and, if this be our conclusion, it necessarily follows, that we must believe, that the letter was intended to induce the House to come over to his way of thinking, or to the opinion expressed by him, relative to that evidence. The main point for the reader to consider here, however, is, how far this running before his judges, in their decision upon the evidence, corresponds with that solemn assertion of "*innocence*," contained in the letter. This is the point for the public to consider. The inquiry had been gone through. Every thing that could be produced, on the side of the accused, had been produced. There had been no want of advisers, or of assistants, of any sort, or of any size. The whole case was before the House, and, owing to the Duke's friends, before the public also. It was, it appears to me, the part of "*conscious innocence*" to wait, with impatience, no doubt; but with confidence, for the *decision*; and not to run before the judges with a request, that they would come to *no decision at all*, or, at least to *no other de-*

cision than that of an *acquittal*. This is not the part usually acted by “conscious innocence.”—Extraordinary as the whole of the letter is, the close has still so much of this quality in it as to make it a conspicuous object even in such a group of extraordinary propositions. The Duke claims of the *justice* of the House, that he shall not be condemned without a *trial*, or be “deprived of the benefit and protection “which is” [are he means] “afforded to “every British subject, by those *sanctions*, “under which alone, evidence is received “in the ordinary administration of law.”—By “those *sanctions*,” he means *oaths*, I suppose; and then, the first observation to make, is, that the evidence in *his favour*, as well as that against him, has not been taken upon *oath*.—The House of Commons is in the habit of taking evidence in this way, and in *deciding* upon it too; and, there appears to be no sound reason, why the Duke of York should be exempted from the effect of its power in this respect.—But, that which is most striking here, is, that the mode which has been adopted, in the inquiry, is the very mode pointed out by *his friends*, in *opposition* to the mode pointed out by Mr. Wardle, who, to his immortal honour, brought forward the charges, and who, after having preferred the Charges, moved for the *appointment of a committee* to inquire into them, and, before a committee, so appointed, the witnesses would have been examined upon *oath*. Mr. ADAM opposed this, and conjured the House not to appoint a committee of this sort, but to have the inquiry open at the bar. He said (see page 199 of this Vol.) that, “*in justice* to its own privileges and “to the dignified character of the illustrious personage, the House ought not to “surrender its *inquisitorial* powers, nor de-“legate to any *Select* or *Secret Committee* that inquiry, which to be efficient, “must be public, and *for the publicity of* “which there was no person more anxious than “the Duke of York.”—Mr. WILBERFORCE wished for a committee, capable of examining the witnesses upon *oath*.—Mr. PERCEVAL was for an inquiry at the bar of the House; and he said (see page 200), that “some consideration ought to be extended to the wish of his Royal Highness.” That wish, he could *positively state*, was “that the investigation should be the most “complete and public. (*hear! hear! hear!*) “There was nothing that his royal highness “so particularly deprecated as any secret or “close discussion of those charges. Standing, as that illustrious personage did, on

“the fairness of his character, and the “fulness of the evidence which he was enabled “to produce, he was desirous of being ac-“quitted by the most public investigation.”

—Lord FOLKESTONE wished for a select committee, seeing how difficult a matter it was to carry on a fair inquiry at the bar of the House.—Mr. CANNING was for the examination at the bar; he said that the history of parliament was replete with precedents for it; and, he called it “a “species of trial which united *earliness* “with *publicity*.”—Thus, was this mode of inquiry, upon the suggestion of Mr. Adam, the twenty years gratuitous adviser of the Duke, adopted, in *opposition* to the course pointed out and moved for by Mr. Wardle; and, the Chancellor of the Exchequer states *positively*, that it is *this mode of inquiry, that the Duke of York wishes for*.—Well, he has had his wish. The inquiry is over. It has taken place. It is closed. And, what does he now, in his own name, and under his own hand, tell this same House of Commons? Why, that he has, thus far, been “deprived;” aye “depriv-“ed,” of what Mr. Wardle and Mr. Wilberforce and Lord Folkestone, contrary to his wishes, expressed by Mr. Perceval, wanted him to have; and, upon the ground of this deprivation, amongst other grounds, he desires the House not to adopt any proceeding *prejudicial to his honour*; though he appears to have no sort of objection to their *acquitting* him. This, I think, does very far surpass every thing of the sort that I ever heard of in all my life. I have seen many remarkable instances of the presumption of power; but any thing like this, or nearly approaching a resemblance to it, I never before witnessed.—The Duke’s wish, the wish of the accused, prevailed over that of the accuser. The accused has had the mode of trial which he chose; and now the trial is over, he seems to think it no trial at all, unless the decision shall be that of *acquittal*. Upon evidence, not taken upon *oath*, he is willing to be *acquitted*; but, he is not willing to be condemned without “a *trial*!” Why, Mr. Canning called this a species of *trial*: but it was not called a *trial* for a *quittal* only.—Let us look upon the thing on the other side. Suppose the House had found no evidence in support of the charges; would they not instantly have voted the charges false and groundless, and accused the accusers of infamous calumny? To be sure they would; and, are we to be told, that they ought not now to condemn, or censure; that they ought not now to adopt

proceedings prejudicial to the honour of the accused, upon the evidence received in the same way? If they were now to acquit the Duke, and any one of us were to tell them that they had done wrong, would they not send us to Newgate for a gross breach of their privileges? Oh, God! it makes one's flesh creep upon one's bones.—They may acquit, but they cannot condemn. A strange court indeed, this! Mr. Canning talked of the House in its *judicial* capacity; but he certainly had no idea of this sort. Mr. Perceval talked of *acquittal*, or of *condemnation*; Mr. Canning again talked of *infamy* upon the head of the *accused* or the *accuser*, as the necessary result of the inquiry; but, if we adopt the doctrine of the Duke's letter, the only person in danger of infamy was the *accuser*.—People of England, you who pay the taxes, and you who are to fight for your country, have your eyes steadily fixed upon what is now doing in the House of Commons.

Seeing that, at the present moment, the *whole of the case*, of the Duke of York, is fresh in the public mind, I think it will be best to defer a continuation of my analysis of the separate cases, 'till we have taken time to examine some very important matter, that presses forward for observation, connected with what appears to be, by some, regarded as a *set-off* to the charges and evidence.—During the examinations, Colonel Gordon was frequently asked questions touching the excellence of the Duke's regulations as to promotions, and so forth; and as to the good effect, which they were calculated to have upon the discipline and efficiency of the army. The Colonel's answers, were, all through, calculated to produce a great idea of the good, which had been done, owing to the Duke of York being Commander in Chief.—When the whole of the examinations, at all *relating to the charges*, had been gone through, recourse was had to the evidence of general officers, who were members of the House, in order to shew how much benefit the army had derived from the chief commandery of the Duke of York.—Now, before we enter upon this part of the interesting scene, let us ask, *why* this sort of evidence? why evidence as to the discipline and state of the army was called for, in a case, where the charges were of *corruption*? If a shepherd be tried for sheep-stealing, is evidence ever brought respecting the healthy and excellent state of the flock? The fact about the *stealing* is the

only thing to be inquired into in such a case. It has always a bad look to see an accused person, or the advocates of an accused person, *fly off* from the point at issue. Meet that point first. Get a decision upon that; and then urge your claims upon other accounts. When you accuse any one of being a *liar*, and he answers, "I am no *thief*," all the hearers know very well what to conclude as to the charge of his being a liar.—Now for this famous evidence, the task of bringing out which was undertaken by Mr. CHARLES YORKE. General NORRIS was asked, whether "the army had been improved, or not, since the Duke of York had had the chief command;" to which he answered, "I think the discipline was as good before the Duke of York had the command." Being asked nearly the same question again, he answers: "I should suppose it may have improved. Still, I think, the troops were as good in General Wolfe's time."—Sir JAMES PULTENEY said, that "the condition of the army had improved; that the discipline had improved; that the facility of manœuvring had been greatly improved, since the Duke of York took the command."—Sir ARTHUR WELLESLEY corroborated the evidence of Sir James Pulteney, and added this very striking part of his statement: "I know that his royal highness has given general satisfaction in the promotion of officers, and I have never found that he departed from any rule laid down for a promotion in the army."—General FITZPATRICK said, that the good which the army had derived from the command of his royal highness was so great, as well as so notorious, that any appeal, upon the subject, to general officers, was unnecessary.—Now, first as to *discipline*, where have we, in the experience, any proof of such improvements? Discipline, like every thing else, ought to be estimated by the effects which we see it produce.—Dunkirk, the Helder, Ferrol, Buenos Ayres, Cintra, Galicia, &c. &c.! Aye, very true! There may have been *no fault* in either case; but, still, the excellence of armies is proved by their victories, and by their victories *only*. Why have we so high an opinion of our fleet? Only because it is so constantly victorious. Read the account below of the actions of Lord Cochrane\*. Do we hear of such things

\* The GERONA Gazette of Jan. 4, in inserting a letter from his lordship to the Junta of that city, pays the following tri-

in our army? Not that I would cast a reflection upon the officers of the army, many of whom are, doubtless, made of as good stuff as Lord Cochrane, and had they had his naval education, would have been doing what he is doing; but, what I say is this, that we must judge of the excellence of an army as we do of the excellence of a fleet, and that is *by its deeds*. And this, I beg the reader to observe, was the principle, upon which Sir Arthur Wellesley first met the charges against the Duke. He then said, that the victory of Vimiera was owing to the excellent state of the army, and that the House in thanking him for that victory, was in fact, though indirectly, thanking the Duke of York also. Now, then, pray let the argument be as good on the one side as it is on the other. If the Duke is to be thanked for the victories, pray let him have his share of the blame for the defeats. Sir Arthur does not appear to have been aware, that he had got hold of a two-edged argument; but, it does not follow that no one else should perceive it.——

*Discipline*, in the view of some people, seems to mean nothing more than the regulations respecting the movements upon parade, or at a field-day. The dressing to right and left; the quick and slow step; the locking up and the opening of ranks; the wheeling and facing and the tossing of

bute to his conduct.——“ This gallant Englishman has been entitled to the admiration and gratitude of this country, from the first moment of its political resurrection. His generosity in co-operating with our earliest efforts, the encouragement we received from the interest he took with the Commanders of the Balearic Islands to induce them to succour us with troops and ammunition, can never be erased from our recollection. The extraordinary services which we owe to his indefatigable activity, particularly this city and the adjacent coast, in protecting us from the attempts of the enemy, are too well known to be repeated here.—It is a sufficient eulogium upon his character to mention, that in the defence of the Castle of Trinilad, when the Spanish flag, hoisted on the wall, fell into the ditch, under a most dreadful fire from the enemy, his Lordship was the only person who, regardless of the shower of balls flying about him, descended into the ditch, re-turned with the flag, and happily succeeded in placing it where it was before.”

the firelock; the queuing of hair and the polishing of arms and accoutrements. Why, these are the science of drill-serjeants, hundreds of whom there are, who would beat even the Duke of York at any branch of these important affairs, which are all forgotten the moment an army takes the field, and which serve merely to fill up the leisure hours of officers and soldiers, when they have no real military duty to perform. They are most of them very proper; but, they have nothing to do with what, in a comprehensive mind, is viewed as the *discipline* of an army, which consists in great and general regulations, relating to obedience, to the administration of justice, to the talents and experience of commanders, to the distribution of duty and of power, all which require much experience as well as much reflection, much solidity of head as well as much integrity of heart. To hear Sir James Pulteney, upon a question of *discipline*, talk of the putting six regiments together to manœuvre, is truly astonishing. This has nothing to do with the discipline of an army, any more than with the House in Gloucester-place.—— But, even in point of look, of mere parade look, and movement, I put it to any man, who can bring his mind back to what the army was 20 years ago, to say whether it has, even in this respect, improved. In the year 1789 I remember seeing the Sixth Regiment of foot, in New Brunswick, and I have never seen such a regiment since that time. I saw the 12th regt. of foot about the year 1785; they had no Austrian caps on, no black leggings, and no short face-less coats. They had the old grenadier caps and the old battalion hats; except on duty, they wore any coloured stockings, and any sort of buckles; their coats had good warm skirts to them, and they were not much of the tight and truss-looking sort. They were commanded by old Major Picton, who had, I believe, been a private in the regiment, in which the present General Picton was then a lieut. of grenadiers. But, with all this old-fashioned work about them, they were the finest regiment I ever saw in my life; and, during about a year that I knew them, I do not believe, that there were above two men punished at the halberts. Will any man persuade me, then, that such a regt. as the 12th was then, would not have been as efficient in the field as if they had been screwed up in tight Austrian jerkins? It must be allowed, that the very great augmentation of its num-

bers has rendered it impossible to keep the army what it formerly was, either in point of morals, or of the size of the men. This I am willing to allow; but, really, when, on the one hand, I see the poor dirty-looking things that now wear, after the German fashion, sashes twisted round them every day in the week; and, on the other hand, look back to the serjeants of 20 years ago, I am astonished to hear any one say that the army has *improved*. Still, I do allow, that it is quite impossible to have so large an army what the army was, and what it might be again if reduced to 30,000 men. I do not blame the Duke of York, because the army is not now what it then was; nor do I blame him because 12 or 15 thousand officers are not so select as 2 thousand officers were; but, I greatly blame his friends for endeavouring to make us believe, that the army formerly was bad, compared to what it is now, which I say is not the fact, and which, from the nature of things, cannot be the fact.—But, something has been said about the Duke having bettered the *condition* of the soldier. I have no wish to deny him a disposition to render the soldier's lot more comfortable, nor the merit of having taken a proper part in any measure of that sort; but, I believe, no one will deny, that the augmentation of pay was absolutely necessary to the bare existence of the men; the time when the augmentation took place must, too, not be forgotten; and, at any rate, the means came out of the pocket of the public and not of the Duke of York. Still, however, I do not wish to withhold from him any part of the praise due to this consideration for the then wretched state of the soldier; but, I must insist, and I am pretty sure, that the public will be of my opinion, that let who would have been the chief commander of the army, the pay, at the time referred to, must have been augmented, or that starvation, absolute starvation, would have driven the men from the ranks. Then, again, who will venture to assert, or to suppose, that what has been done for the comfort of the soldier, would not have been done under *any other* commander in chief? When the salaries of the Judges were augmented, did they receive the augmentation as a boon, as a gift from the *minister* of the day? No; but as an act of justice at the hands of the country; as something due to their services and their rank; as no more than a just compensation for the use of their great talents, and for their arduous and almost unremitting

labours. It is not at all agreeable to my notions, nor, I hope, to the notions either of those who pay, or those who receive, to look upon what is given in the way of augmentation to the income of any servant of the public, as a gift on the part of those, be they who they may, that propose, or support, the making of that augmentation. —Now, we come to a part of this evidence, which has some slight bearing upon the charges before the House, namely, what Sir Arthur Wellesley says about that “great and general satisfaction which “the Duke has given as to matters of *promotion*, and about his inflexible adherence to the rules laid down relating to “promotions.” This is all very well, but the worst of it is, that we have the cases of *Captain Maling* and of *Sammy Carter* before us; not in hearsay, not in assertion, but in *proof*. Sammy we will leave ‘till another time; but, there is a part of Colonel Gordon's evidence (for reminding me of which I am obliged to some very acute and excellent remarks in the *COURIER*) which we must here take particular notice of, as it will, in a twinkling, give us a most correct idea of all this boasted *regularity* and *inflexibility* about promotions.

(Page 47). Colonel GORDON says, I conceive it *my particular duty* to take care and report to the Commander in Chief, that any Officer whose name is submitted to his Royal Highness is a fit and proper person, duly qualified in all respects as to character, as to *points of service*, and as to his Majesty's regulations for the service into which he is so recommended.

It is a regulation of the army, his Majesty's regulation, that no Subaltern can be promoted to a company, either by purchase or without, under a *service of two years*.

(Page 49, he says) The regulations are briefly these: an officer must serve as a Subaltern two years before he can be a *Captain*, and he must have served six years before he can be a Field Officer. *I never knew an instance of those rules being broken through*, always, as in merchants accounts, saying *errors excepted*.

(Page 53, to Col. GORDON). Has it ever come within your knowledge, that any officer has been promoted *without any service whatever?* *No, it has not.*

(Page 55, to Col. GORDON). What were the services of Captain Maling's brother, who is, I believe, a Captain in the army, who is in the War Office? There is a Captain Maling, an assistant of mine in the Office of the Commander in Chief; I

take it for granted, that is the person referred to. What his services are as a Lieutenant, *I really do not know*; I found him as a Lieutenant in the Office of the Commander in Chief; and in consideration of his extraordinary good character, and more than common abilities, the promotions of the army going through his hands, under mine, *I did recommend him* to his Royal Highness the Commander in Chief to be placed upon the half-pay as a Captain, upon which half-pay he most assuredly will be placed as soon as an opportunity offers; but the Commander in Chief has it not in his power.

(Page 56, to Colonel GORDON). Do you know whether or not that Captain Maling ever joined and did duty with any regiment? *I do not know* that he did; and *I do not think that he did*.

"This case," adds the COURIER, "speaks so plainly for itself, that it requires no comment. Most surprising it is that Colonel Gordon has impressed many persons with an opinion of the great accuracy of his memory, and his rigid conformity to the rules of the service. Now, the Colonel's memory, poor man, seems as fallible as that of any other person who has been examined. During an examination into the undue promotion of the brother of Captain Maling of the War-Office, he does not know of any officer being promoted without any service whatever, though in a few minutes afterwards he owns he himself has lately recommended to be promoted to a Company, Maling's brother, a gentleman daily employed under him, who never served in any Regiment whatever, or even joined one. How unlucky that the man he had the most concern with in the world, (the Duke excepted) and whose brother's case was under consideration at the moment, should thus have slipped altogether out of his memory, though he, the Colonel, had lately recommended him for promotion, for lately it must be. And how unlucky that the Colonel, so very nice in enquiring into the qualifications of Officers as to points of service before he submits their names to the Duke, should himself have recommended a gentleman who never served at all! But let this military paragon take the advantage of his "errors excepted." If he cannot justify himself in the field of Mars, he has fortunately put in a saving clause which must secure his acquittal in Change-alley." — This case alone gives us a pretty good view of the rigid

adherence, the inflexible adherence, to the rules laid down about promotion; and, whatever Sir Arthur Wellesley may think of it, it will weigh most lumpingly against any general assertion, founded upon the observation of any general in the army.—

But, let us take another case, containing a contrast; and though the facts may be dry in detail, they cannot fail to be useful.

FREDERICK ADAM (son of Mr. Wm. Adam) was an

DATE. AGE.

Ensign in the 26th Reg. of foot. 1797 - 14.

Lieut. in the same - - - 1798 - 15.

Lieut. with rank of } Guards 1799 - 16.

Capt. \_\_\_\_\_ } Capt. \_\_\_\_\_

Major in the 5th Bat. Reserve 1803 - 20.

Lt. Col. in the same - - - 1804 - 21.

Lt. Col. in 21st foot - - - 1805 - 22.

Now, mark, reader; I beg you to mark it well; that Colonel Gordon says, that the rules of the service are, that an officer must *sacrifice* Six Years before he can be a *field officer*, that is to say, a Major, a Lt. Colonel or a Colonel; but, we here find, that Frederick Adam became a field officer in four years after he entered the army; at the age of 20 years; and that of these four years, a part, at least, according to his father's own statement, was spent, not in *service*, but *at school*.—No comment is necessary; but now let us see the contrast.

ANTHONY FRENCH, who was a captain in the 21st Reg. of foot, at the period when Frederick Adam entered the army and was put to school at Woolwich, is still a Captain, and, in that same regiment, is of course under the command of Frederick Adam.

FREDERICK JONES, } who were Lieutenants, in the 26th

JAMES CONNOLLY, } foot, in 1798, at the time when Frederick Adam was a Lieutenant in that Regiment hold, at the present moment, the rank of Captain in that corps.

MONTAGUE WYNYARD, } who were senior Lieutenants, in the Coldstream Guards, to Frederick

CHARLES PHILIPS, } Adam, when the latter was serving with them, are Lieutenants in that Regiment still.

These facts have been stated to me, in a letter, in which I am referred to the army lists, published by authority. I have not those lists at hand; but if the statement be incorrect, the error can, at once, be rectified by a reference to those lists.—Now, then, what are we to think about the in-

flexible adherence to the rules of promotion? What are we to think about that "general satisfaction," which we are told, that the Duke's management of promotions has given? — I am of opinion, and so must, I think, every reasonable man, that a strict rule of promotion by *seniority* would be a very bad rule; that it would damp all emulation; and that little that is brilliant, daring, glorious, could be expected in such a service. But, then, seniority must be a *rule*, and a departure from it the *exception*; else all would be mere favour, caprice, and intrigue. That there ought to be the *power* of departing from the rule we all allow; reason says it should be so; but, then, reason, united with justice, say, that this power never should be exercised, except in cases where the *good of the service* demands such exercise; and, in cases, too, where that demand is so obvious that there can be *no doubt* upon the point. *Length of service* is, of itself, a military merit; such it has always been deemed; and it has been a rule to reward accordingly. When, therefore, there exists no particular, no special and *obvious* reason for preferring one man to another, the rule of seniority ought to be strictly adhered to. Now, in the case of Frederick Adam, to say nothing about his rank and promotion, while *at school*, there does not appear any such special and obvious reason for a preference. His father says, he behaved very bravely and skilfully in Holland at the age of 16 years; but, will he pretend to say, that there were not many other officers, his seniors, whose good conduct was not equal to his? No, no; it is not on account of an act of *ordinary* merit, that will warrant a departure from the rule of seniority. Had it, indeed, fallen to the lot of Frederick Adam to go, as we see Lord Cochrane has done (and which, had the occasion offered, I have no doubt he would), into the ditch of a rampart, and, amidst a shower of balls, bring up the flag of the fortress, and again set it flying defiance against the enemy; had a case of this sort occurred, the whole army would have seen the rule of seniority departed from, not only without pain, but with pleasure. But no such case appears to have existed; we never till now heard of any extraordinary merit in the son of Mr. Adam; most of us never heard of his name before; nay, for my own part, I am amongst those, who did not know that Mr. Adam had a son in the army. Besides, we see Frederick Adam, not only promoted over the heads of his

seniors, at the out-set, and in one regiment; but, we see him going from corps to corps, and we see his good fortune still follow him, wherever he goes; we see him still and still jumping over the heads of his seniors.—It must, I think, be manifest to every man, that such preferences cannot fail to be greatly injurious to the service. When officers see their juniors get the start of them, without any such claim as I have before described, it is impossible, decidedly impossible, that their zeal should not be damped; that they should not have a cold heart for the service; and that, in the end, they should not care to have any care beyond that of mere self. This is so obvious, and there are so many thoughts connected with it, which will, at once, strike the reader, that I shall not longer dwell upon it.—I do not know whether it occurred to any body else, but to me it immediately did, upon reading General Fitzpatrick's evidence, in praise of the Duke of York's commandership, to express a wish to know, according to what "*rule of promotion*" it was, that the General, who had not been in any *military* service, I believe, for above 20 years, and who, I believe, had not actually served since he was a *Captain* in the Guards, came to have a *Regiment given to him*, the moment Mr. Fox and his party came into place, in 1806. We see, that in the case of Major Brooke, a stoppage of the proposed exchange took place, the Major having been *upon half pay for six years*. This circumstance required an inquiry, one of Colonel Gordon's *inquiries*. The Colonel does not (what a pity!) keep any *minutes* of his inquiries, or I should certainly be for asking him to oblige us with a copy of the *inquiry*, made with respect to General Fitzpatrick, who had, for so many years, I believe a full *quarter of a century*, been, not upon half pay, but upon no pay at all, at least, I mean, as an officer in the army. Perhaps, if we were to search through the whole of the army list, we should not find a more complete instance of the excellent arrangements at the Commander-in-Chief's office, than this instance of the promotion of General Fitzpatrick. It is notorious; it is a thing not to be denied by any one, that he had, for many years, been living in and about London, with not the smallest appearance of any thing military about him, with the sole exception of the rank prefixed to his name; nor have I ever heard, that he ever actually served, either abroad or at home, except in the Guards, as far as the rank

of Captain. And yet, he not only came into the army all at once, as soon as Mr. Fox was in office, but had the Colonely and the *profits* of a regiment given to him. This is not for *life*, indeed; it is not so good as a patent place, which has been compared to a freehold estate; it is not so good as that, because, if the king pleases, he can, at any time, without reason assigned, *take the regiment away*. But, it is a good thing, as long as the General has it; and the reader will readily suppose, that, in the whole of our army, containing from 12 to 15 thousand officers, a person might have been found with *as good* claims to a regiment as General Fitzpatrick.—And yet, we are desired; in the face of all this, we are desired to believe, that nothing in the world can be better managed than the promotions of the army have been; that the rules of promotion are most religiously adhered to; and that the Duke's conduct, as to promotions, in particular, have given "*general satisfaction*." We are a *believing* nation. There is hardly any thing too much for us in this way. But, I really do think, that our belief is not quite equal to this.—After all, however, the conduct of the Duke of York, in the general management of the army, has, the reader will clearly see, nothing at all to do with the *specific Charges* against him. Those charges must stand, or fall, upon their own merits; and, unless the Duke can produce *evidence* to rebut the evidence brought against him, all the efforts of his supporters, in any other way, are perfectly useless.

---

We now come to a matter, which, though not relating to any of the charges against the Duke of York, is so nearly connected with them as never to be lost sight of when we are making observations, as to the effects of the transactions stated in those charges.—I allude to the *general traffic for Offices and Places under Government*, which, as the reader will remember, has before been a subject of observation with me, upon many occasions. At page 181 of the present volume, I inserted several advertisements relating to the sale of such offices and places, and, in the half-month's papers, from which I collected them, I found one for a *Writership*, one for a *Cadetship*, and several relating to commissions in the *Militia*; but, as no *money* was spoken of in the latter case, I did not insert it, and really, as to the East India sovereigns' offices, I thought they were *always* bought and sold; and how should I think other-

wise, when I saw, in the course of every year, so many hundreds of advertisements like those here spoken of; nor was it without the most agreeable surprize, that, when Mr. Donovan's disclosure came forth, I found that the East India Directors took the thing to heart, and called for "*a committee, up-stairs*," to inquire into "so serious a matter." This was a most agreeable surprize to me, who had seen their offices advertised for sale for so many years, without one word having ever been said against such advertisements, or such sale.—As to the offices and places under the government of this country, I had, more than once, and a long while ago, taken advertisements, relating to them, for *mottos* to my Register; and, in one Number, having such a motto, I appealed to Mr. Perceval, whether such things were proper; whether they were not calculated to disgust the country; and I asked him *why the authors were not prosecuted*.—This statement, intended to refresh the mind of the reader, is by way of preface to the very curious matter that came out in the House of Commons, from the lips of Mr. Perceval, on the 24th of February, relating to a prosecution of that sort, which was so long ago recommended by me.—He, the report of the proceedings says, "informed the House, that although he had taken the address of the house in Threadneedle-street, from the hon. gentleman, (Mr. Wardle), who alluded to it in opening his charge against the Duke of York, as if he (Mr. Perceval) had been a stranger to its existence, yet that he was perfectly aware of the circumstance at that time. The reason of his pretending ignorance, on the subject, was owing to this:—A gentleman had written to him on the 12th January, stating, that on reading an advertisement for the sale of an office under Government, he had answered it to the persons who kept this office, and was then in treaty for it. He was sent to the Solicitor of the Treasury, who had instructions to furnish any sum of money necessary for a deposit, and to proceed in the business till the parties were entrapped beyond the possibility of escaping the law. The business was in this state at the time the hon. gentleman had brought forward his charges, and he thought it imprudent to appear as if at all acquainted with the subject. An indictment was now filed against Messrs. Pullen and Haylock, and a Lady of the name of Harvey, as well as against the Banker (Watson, it afterwards ap-

"peared) who received the deposit.—"From what he had said, it would be seen "that Government had determined to inquire into and proceed against these abuses a considerable time before the hon. gentleman brought the subject of inquiry before the House."—Oh! no, no, no!—No, no! Not "a considerable time." Mr. Wardle brought forward his charges on the 27th of January; but, he gave notice of his intention so to do about a week before that. Well, this leaves but eight days between Mr. Perceval's receiving "the gentleman's" letter, and the notice of Mr. Wardle, which notice, observe, must, in this case, be coupled with the threat of Mrs. Clarke, sent to Mr. Adam so long ago as the month of June last. Eight days is not what we mean by a "considerable time," in such cases; nor must we allow Mr. Wardle thus to be deprived of this part of the effect of his exertions.—Besides, though Mr. Perceval got the "gentleman's" letter (Mr. Wardle always mentioned names) on the 12th of January, it does not follow, that he set the Solicitor of the Treasury to work before Mr. Wardle gave notice of a motion. This does not follow; and, if I had been one of the House, I would have called for names, dates, and papers of all sorts.—The great object, in this most curious movement, evidently was, to cause the public to believe, that the government was, of itself, disposed to put a stop to these shameful transactions, and that it would have done it, if Mr. Wardle had never been born; and, the proof is, that it had actually set to work, even before his notice of any charges was given.—To believe this, we must also believe that there has been a very wonderful concurrence; a wonderful jumping of judgment. Yes, we must believe; it does not signify talking about "a gentleman's" letter; we must believe it to be very strange indeed, that, just at this time, the government should have taken the first, the very first step, in the detection and punishment of those who buy and sell offices and places; and that an advertisement, too, should set them to work, though thousands of such advertisements have appeared, during the last 10 or 15 years. Very strange, indeed!—But, though Mr. Wardle did not give his notice till the 20th of January, or thereabouts, will Mr. Perceval say, that he did not hear of Mr. Wardle's intention so to do, long before the 20th or even the famous 12th of January? Will he say, that he did not hear of this? I did. I heard

of it in the first week of January, and, I believe, on the 2nd day of the month; and the intention, as being publicly rumoured, was mentioned to me in a letter, the day after my return home, which was on the 9th of January. Nay, must it not have been known to the ministers before the 12th of January? Must not this have been the case, from the inquiries of Mr. Wardle? He says, that he had been about a month at work to get at his facts; and, will any one believe, that the ministers were not well acquainted with all his movements? Aye, from the first or second day of them, at the latest. The moment Mr. Wardle began his inquiries, the whole gang of jobbers would, of course, be in alarm, and like a nest of hornets, disturbed by the intrusion of the spade, would begin to fly about, in all directions. Such a thing could not be kept secret for half an hour; and, are we, good souls as we are, to believe, that the ministers would be the last to hear of it?—Now, then, let us look back again at what this very Mr. Perceval said in the Debate, the ever-memorable Debate, of the 27th of January, which see at page 201 of this volume. Having read that passage, having recollect the "loud and general laugh," which the House set up, when they heard Mr. Wardle's description of the office in Threadneedle Street; and having also called to mind the scoffs, which, on account of this part of his statement, the ministerial papers, and particularly the Nabobs' Gazette, uttered against Mr. Wardle; having thus refreshed his memory, the reader will be the better able to judge, whether the prosecution, now mentioned by Mr. Perceval, would ever have taken place had it not been for Mr. Wardle's most admirable conduct.—Again. As Mr. Perceval was in possession of such facts, before Mr. Wardle brought forward his charges, how came Mr. Perceval to speak, generally, as to that gentleman's charges, as he did? Might not one have reasonably expected to hear him, who was in possession of such facts, speak more on Mr. Wardle's side, and not oppose him in his mode of inquiry, not hold the language of defiance, language calculated to throw discredit upon all that Mr. Wardle said?—It remains to be accounted for, too, why this acknowledgment of the ministers, as to the existence of the traffic, was kept back 'till after the inquiry was over,' till after such damning proofs had been produced? This is a very important circumstance. Being in pos-

session of such facts, one would have expected to hear Mr. Perceval taking the first opportunity to state them, and to acknowledge that Mr. Wardle had but too good grounds for his statement respecting the Threadneedle Street Office. But, on the contrary, Mr. Wardle had to go through the whole inquiry, with the *denial*, the flat *denial*, against him, that the ministers knew any thing of any such practices.—The concise view of the matter is this: That Advertisements, for the purchase and sale of offices and places under government, have appeared, in all the News-papers, for many years past, to the number of many hundreds in every year, with as much boldness as the advertisements for Mr. Packwood's razor strops, or Doctor Spilsbury's drops;—that, more than a year ago, and more than once, I took such advertisements for my motto, and, in an essay, or in essays, upon the subject, called upon Mr. Perceval himself, to know why such offences were not punished by law;—that it now appears, that the government has always had the power of punishing such acts by law;—that no such punishment, and that no prosecution for any such offence, has ever taken place, nor have we ever heard, that the government has ever made any inquiry into the matter;—that in June, 1808, Mrs. Clarke sends letters to Mr. Adam, threatening an exposure of her practices under the Duke of York;—that in December, or in the first days of January last, Mr. Wardle sets to work making inquiries, as to the practices of Mrs. Clarke, and as to the practices of other dealers in offices and places under government;—that, on the 20th of January, Mr. Wardle gives notice of a motion respecting the Duke of York;—that, on the 27th of January he brings forward his charges against the Duke, and states, at the same time, that there is an office in Threadneedle Street for the sale of offices and places under government:—that Mr. Perceval (*one of the king's ministers*) treats this statement in a manner whence it appears that he discredits the existence of such practices;—that Mr. Wardle, between the 27th of January and the 23rd of February, pursues his charges against the Duke, and produces *undeniable proof* of the existence of such practices to a great extent;—that, *after all this*, and on the 24th of February, out comes Mr. Perceval with information to the House, that he knew of such practices *on the 12th of January*, that the parties in one instance, are under prosecution by the

government, that the preparation for this prosecution was going on before Mr. Wardle brought forward his charges, and that he (Mr. Perceval), on the 27th of January, “*pretended ignorance*” of such practices, only for the purpose of keeping from the parties any suspicion of the measures that were taking to *entrap* them.—From these propositions; this chain of undeniable facts, the reader will easily decide, whether the prosecution, now said to be undertaken, has proceeded purely from the disposition of the government to punish such infamous practices; or whether it has proceeded from a desire, on the part of the government, to save itself from the effects of a suspicion that it had participated in, or, at least, winked at, such practices, and that it never would have attempted to put a stop to them, had it not been for Mr. Wardle.—This question the reader will easily decide, and, as he must be convinced, that it is a question of great importance, I trust the decision will remain *deeply imprinted on his mind*. It must be, I think, clear to every man of only common discernment, that what is now going on, must, sooner or later, lead to momentous events. To, I hope and trust, a great, a radical, and a salutary change; a change that shall *destroy* no branch of our excellently formed government, but that shall *renovate* them all. The great misfortune of other governments has been, that, while the *higher classes* have “*indulged*,” as Burke calls it, “in ‘all their vicious humours,’ the *second class* have been, by one tie or another, induced to remain in inactivity, and that, at last, the work of reform has fallen to the hands of the *lower class*; and, then, need we wonder at the wild work they have made? That we now stand in need of reform, there is no man, not even a trading Anti-Jacobin, will attempt to deny. That a reform must and will come, is, I think, as evident; and, is it not, then, the duty of persons in the *middling rank* of life to act in such a manner as to prevent the danger of this work of reform falling into the hands of those, who cannot be supposed capable of managing it well? To talk of a love of country is as easy as to talk of any thing else. The country calls for *deeds*, not words. The excuses of her professed lovers are exactly those made by the Calf, to “*THE HARE WITH MANY FRIENDS.*”

“Older and abler pass you by;

“How strong are those! How weak am I!

" Should I presume to bear you hence,  
 " Those friends of mine might take offence.  
 " Excuse me, then,—You know my heart;  
 " But dearest friends, alas! must part.  
 " How shall we all lament! Adieu!  
 " For, see, the hounds are just in view."

But, to the *coldness of the Calf's friendship* (to give it the mildest term) we, if we remain inert, add the grossest of *folly*; because in the fate of the country, *our own fate* is inextricably involved. Evils, when taken *in time*, are deprived of half their mischievous qualities. Yet, though this is so manifestly the time for the people to beseech the king to adopt such measures as shall effectually guard them, in future, against the effects of a system of corruption like that which now stands exposed before them, not a county, not a city, not a town, not a village, not a *single man* do we see bestir himself. The whole population of the kingdom seem to stand by as *unconcerned spectators*; or, at best, to discover little more than mere *curiosity*; and this, too, at a moment, when, by a constitutional exercise of their rights, their opinions, the opinions which they *all* entertain, respectfully but plainly expressed, might, and would, speedily produce a reform equally advantageous to their sovereign and themselves, and hurtful to none but the domestic and foreign foes of their happiness and of their country's independence.—It was not thus that our forefathers acted towards us; and it is not thus that we ought to act towards our children.

*Botley, Thursday, 2 March, 1809.*

#### TO THE READER.

BEING under the necessity of *raising the price* of this publication, from *ten-pence* to *one shilling*, I beg leave to state the grounds, upon which, after long hesitation, I, at last, reluctantly do it.—When the work was begun I paid *twenty-four* shillings a ream for the paper; I now pay *fifty-three* shillings a ream; and, it is well known, that printers' work has greatly augmented in price since that time.—Of the *ten-pence*, at present received, *three-pence halfpenny* goes, in advance, for the stamp, the discount upon which is scarcely sufficient to meet the loss from torn stamps, to say nothing of the *unsold numbers*; the paper costs more than *a penny*, allowing nothing for torn paper; to the news-man the allowance is *two-pence*. Here is *sixpence halfpenny* out of the *ten-pence*, leaving only *three-pence halfpenny* for printing, for

torn paper, for unsold Numbers, for portage, for carriage of paper, for postage, for a salary to the publisher, for warehouse-room, for divers other expences, which cannot easily be stated, but which amount to a great sum in the course of the year; so that, in the end, I have not, for my constant and infinite labour, nearly one-half so much left, as, with the same application, I could gain in various other ways.—The daily news-papers are, indeed, sold for *sixpence*, and the printing of them is still more expensive. The same may be said of all the weekly news-papers. But, then, look at their *Advertisements*, which, in some of those papers, amount frequently, to forty or fifty pounds a day. Three shillings from each advertisement is taken in *tax*; but, the insertion of the smallest advertisement is, I believe, charged at six shillings; and, if it be charged at a guinea or two guineas, the tax is still but three shillings. Indeed, if it were not for this gain upon the advertisements, and for certain paragraphs, the insertion of which is paid for, a daily paper never could stand. There is *three-pence halfpenny* for the stamp, *a penny* for the paper, and *a penny* for the news-man; so that there is a *halfpenny* left to pay for printing; to pay the Editor, who cannot have less than nine or ten pounds a week; to pay four, five, or six gentlemen for reporting debates, at the rate of about five guineas a week each, all the year round; to pay for a large house, necessarily in the most expensive part of London; to pay for foreign news-papers, which, if I am not mistaken, cost each of the principal daily papers from two to three hundred pounds a year; to pay for postage; to pay numerous other even heavy charges, which it would tire the reader to enumerate; and, at last, to leave the proprietor, necessarily a man of talent and enterprize, a compensation for his time and for the use of his capital, to say nothing of what he has sunk in rearing the establishment.—From this statement, though a very defective representation of the expences, the reader will, at once, see, that the stamp, which has gone on rising from a *halfpenny* to *three-pence halfpenny*, would amount to a *complete prohibition* against the printing of a daily paper at *sixpence*, were it not for the advertisements, which, by-the-bye, no paper is sure of obtaining.—Of all the things that are taxed, nothing is so heavily taxed as this sort of periodical publications. The tax is paid, too, upon the nail, even before the article is made fit for sale. But,

still the tax is, in proportion, heavier upon me (who have no part of my matter, the insertion of which is *paid for*) than it is upon the proprietors of daily papers. My work is, in fact, *not a news-paper*; nor has it any of the lucrative qualities of a news-paper; the nature of its matter would exempt it from the news-paper stamp, but then, without the stamp, it could not be circulated by means of the post-office.—

The stamp-office allows the daily papers a discount of £. 16 per cent. for *torn* and *unsold* Numbers; while it allows me but £. 4. 18*s.* per cent. the reason of which has never appeared to me, seeing that, from the very nature of my work, it is evident that I must lose more than the daily papers by *unsold* Numbers. A daily paper, when it finds its edition too small, can repeat the interesting matter the next day; but, I am obliged to print an *over number*; because the time for the repeating is at too great a distance.—I do not complain of this tax, as a tax; for, though it certainly tends to lessen the power of the press, it is one of those taxes, the manner of levying which does not trench upon a man's personal freedom; but, I have always thought, and I still think, that my publication, in proportion to what is received for each sheet, is, beyond all measure, more heavily taxed than the daily and weekly news-papers, each of which contains so much of value in their advertisements and paid-for paragraphs; and I also think, that even in a mere fiscal point of view, the stamp upon *all* the news-papers is impolitely high. At the same time I think it right to say, that, during the six years that I have carried on this publication, I have never met with any thing annoying, in any department of the Stamp-Office; and that, as often as I have had any thing to do with the Commissioners, I have never found them, under any ministry, disposed to put me to any inconvenience, and that, upon a recent occasion, I have had to acknowledge their indulgence.—

Of the *two-pence*, now to be added to the price of the Register, a *half-penny* will go in additional allowance to the *news-men*, who, when their *labour* and their *house-rent* and their *credit* are all duly considered, have not too much allowed them. The wonder is, indeed, how they can make the business answer; and it is only that incessant application to business, to be found no where but amongst London tradesmen, that could possibly secure a profit from such a trade.—Such

are the grounds, upon which I make the proposed rise in the price of this work, which rise will begin with the Number that will be published on the 13th of March, in order to afford time to gentlemen, who live in the country, to discontinue the work, if they should be disposed to do it on account of the augmentation of price. The step has been taken by me with great reluctance; but, I am persuaded, that there are few persons, who are indulgent enough to set a value upon the effects of my labour, would wish that that labour should go without something like an adequate compensation.

☞ It has been stated to Mr. Budd of Pall Mall, who has sent the statement to me, that “*the Marchioness of Stafford has no pension, and never had any;*” and that it is supposed, that the error, in my statement, arose from the *late* Marchioness having had a pension, as Lady of the Bedchamber to *the Duchess of Brunswick*. I really do not see why the *people of England* ought to have paid a pension on such an account; but, as to the fact, there is no error in *my* statement, as will appear from the following extract, under the head of pensions per annum, as they stood on the 5th January, 1807. “*Gover, Countess, now Marchioness of Stafford, £.300.*”—See the Report, laid before parliament, in June 1808, page 134.

#### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Twenty-seventh Bulletin of the French Army of Spain, continued from page 320.*

The English army suffers considerably; it has no longer ammunition and baggage, and half the English cavalry is on foot. Since our departure from Benevente up to the 5th instant, we counted on the road 1800 English horses, that had been killed.—The remains of Romana's army are found wandering about in all directions, the remains of the army of Mayorca, of Ibernia, of Barcelona, and of Naples, are made prisoners.—General Maupetet having come up with, on the side of Zamora, with his brigade of dragoons, a column of 800 men, charged and dispersed them, and killed or took the greater part.—The Spanish peasantry of Galicia and Leon, have no mercy on the English. Notwithstanding the strictest orders to the contrary, we every day find a number of English assassinated.—The head-quarters of the duke of Elchingen are at Villa Franca, on the confines of

Galicia and Leon. The duke of Belluno is on the Tagus. The whole of the imperial guard is concentrated at Valladolid. The cities of Valladolid, of Palencia, Segovia, Avilla, Astorga, Leon, &c. have sent numerous deputations to the King.—The flight of the English army, the dispersion of the remains of the armies of Romana and Estramadura, and the evils which the troops of the different armies inflict upon the country, rally the provinces round the legitimate authority. The city of Madrid has particularly distinguished itself;—28,500 heads of families have taken the oath of allegiance upon the holy Sacrament. The citizens have promised his Imperial Majesty, that if he will place his brother on the throne, they will serve him with all their efforts, and defend him with all their means.

*Twenty-Eighth Bulletin; dated, Valladolid, Jan. 13.*

The part of the treasure of the enemy which has fallen into our hands is 1,800,000 francs.—The inhabitants assert that the English have carried off from eight to ten millions.—The English general deeming it impossible that the French infantry and artillery should have followed him, and gained upon him a certain number of marches, particularly in mountains so difficult as those of Galicia, thought he could only be pursued by cavalry and sharpshooters. He took therefore the position of Castro on his right, supported by the river Tombago, which passes by Lugo, and is not fordable.—The duke of Dalmatia arrived on the 6th in presence of the enemy. He employed the seventh and eighth in reconnoitring the enemy, and collecting his infantry and artillery, which were still in the rear. He formed his plan of attack. The left only of the enemy was attackable; he manœuvred on their left. His dispositions required some movements on the 8th, the Duke being determined to attack on the 9th; but the enemy retreated in the night, and in the morning our advanced guard entered Lugo. The enemy left 300 sick in the hospitals; a park of 18 pieces of cannon, and 300 waggons of ammunition. We made 700 prisoners.—The town and environs of Lugo are choaked with the bodies of English horses. Hence, upwards of 2500 horses have been killed in the retreat.

The weather is dreadful; rain and snow fall continually.—The English are marching to Corunna in great haste, where they have 400 transports. They have already lost baggage, ammunition, a part even of their most material artillery, and upwards of 3000 prisoners. On the 10th our advanced guard was at Betanzos, a short distance from Corunna. The duke of Elchingen is with his corps near Lugo.—In reckoning the sick, stragglers, those who have been killed by the peasants, and made prisoners by our troops, we may calculate the loss of the English at one third of their army. They are reduced to 18,000 men, and are not yet embarked. From Sahagun they retreated 150 leagues in bad weather, worse roads, through mountains, and always closely pursued at the point of the sword.—It is difficult to conceive the folly of their plan of campaign. It must be attributed not to the general who commands, and who is a clever and skilful man, but to that spirit of hatred and rage which animates the English Ministry. To push forward in this manner 30,000 men, exposing them to destruction, or to flight as their only resource, is a conception which can only be inspired by the spirit of passion, or the most extravagant presumption. (*To be continued.*)

### COBBETT'S COMPLETE COLLECTION OF State Trials:

To be completed in Thirty-Six Monthly Parts, forming Twelve large Volumes in Royal Octavo.

The THIRD PART of the above Work was published on Wednesday, the first of March. One Part will appear, with the greatest regularity, on the first of each succeeding Month. Those Subscribers who have expressed their intention of taking the Work in Quarterly Volumes, are respectfully informed that the First Volume is now ready for delivery.

### COBBETT'S Parliamentary Debates:

The TWELFTH VOLUME is in the Press. All Communications for the above Work, if sent to the Publishers in due time, shall be carefully attended to.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 10.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 11, 1809. [Price 10d.

" That they may do evil with both hands earnestly, the prince asketh, and the judge asketh for a reward; and the great man, he uttereth his mischievous desire: so they wrap it up."—MICAH, Chapter vii. verse 2.

353] [354

## DUKE OF YORK.

(Continued from page 347.)

IN all the books of the Holy Scriptures; amongst all the strong descriptions of prevalent corruption, contained in those writings, I know of none more impressive, more characteristic of a rotten state of things, than that which I have taken for my motto to this sheet. I have, however, not selected it under an idea, that it will be found at all applicable to the result of the proceedings, which have, for so many weeks past, wholly occupied the attention of the public; but, on the contrary, with the confident hope, that the reader will be able to draw a pleasing contrast between that result and the sort of actions, to which the prophet alludes, and at which he expresses the displeasure of the Almighty Ruler of the universe, "the God of truth and justice."—I trust the House of Commons, and every individual of that House, will dismiss all prejudice from their minds, whether it be *against* or *for* the Duke of York; and, I will go further, and say, that I do *believe* that now, whatever may have passed before, whatever symptoms of prejudice may have appeared, on the one side or the other, substantial justice will be done, without any regard to the feelings of either the high or the low.

Upon no occasion, perhaps, since the Revolution in 1688, has there existed, in this country, so great an interest, as to what would be the conduct of its government, as that which exists at the present moment. People, in all ranks of life, have from the beginning of the late Inquiry, been alive, in an unusual degree, to all that was passing. The open statement of the Charges against his Royal Highness had been preceded by numerous rumours and reports, which, though, by the impartial and considerate, were looked upon as including, in many cases, at least, great **exaggerations**, had produced, as it was natural they should, a very great degree of latent discontent; and this discontent was, assuredly, not at all diminished, by the

means that were taken to check the freedom of public discussion, with respect to the subjects of those rumours and reports. The charges were, too, received in a manner, well calculated to heighten the interest naturally attached to the intrinsic merits of the case. Instead of opposing them by a direct or implied negative, the friends of the illustrious personage resorted to recrimination, and dealt their charges about so roundly and so widely, and in a manner so little discriminating, that they compelled all those, who were connected with the press, to wish that the result might show the charges not to have originated in that traitorous conspiracy, which was asserted to exist, of which the press was alledged to have been the organ, and in the fate of which the fate of the press appeared to be completely involved. Hence the press has not failed to participate in the public feeling, nor to gratify the public impatience, in the doing of which, with the greatest possible effect, the form of proceeding, injudiciously chosen by the friends of the Duke of York, has afforded it perfect facility; so that, at this moment, even now, before the discussion upon the evidence has taken place, in the House of Commons, there is scarcely a single person in the whole kingdom, who has not weighed the several cases in his mind with as much care as if they had come before him, he being in the capacity of a juror. Not only, therefore, are there, in this case, the circumstances of the accused party being the Commander in Chief of the Army, a Son of the King, and so near to the Crown as to have but two lives between him and the wearing of it himself; not only are there, in this case, these circumstances, of themselves sufficiently interesting, but there are the additional circumstances, mentioned above, rendering, all together, the sum of interest now excited far greater than what has ever been felt, in this kingdom, since the era of the Revolution.

The eyes of the nation are directed to—  
M

wards its rulers in general; towards the whole of its government, king, lords, and commons. Many persons, accustomed to take little or no interest in public affairs, take interest in this affair. The whole mass of the national thought has been set in motion. What will be the conduct of the several branches of the government, is the question that now engrosses every mind; but, in a more direct and particular manner are the eyes of the nation, for reasons too obvious to point out, fixed upon the House of Commons; and I am persuaded, that every man will agree with me, that, in almost whatever light it be considered, the result of the discussion of Wednesday next, will be the most important that this nation has witnessed for more than a hundred years past.

It must have struck every man, who has been long in the habit of contemplating political motives and actions, that the interest and the importance, which discussions in the House of Commons formerly owed to considerations of *party*, now exist but in a comparatively trifling degree. The death of the two great opposing leaders, under whom the people, as well as the members, ranged themselves, may have contributed towards this result; but, the fact is, that, long before the death of Pitt, the attachments of party had become greatly enfeebled, and are now dwindled almost to nothing. Indeed, there is now in existence nothing that resembles party but the name. There are men, who are in place, and others who, upon all occasions, whether right or wrong, censure the measures of ministers, with the sole view of supplanting them. But, in any other sense, the word party has now no more meaning than has the word *Tory*, which no man has any longer the impudence to use. Parties were formerly distinguished by some great and well-known *principles* of foreign or domestic policy. Now, there are no such distinguishing marks; and, as a natural consequence, the people have become quite indifferent as to all considerations connected with party. Whether, as a general proposition, this indifference be a good or an evil, I will not now attempt to discuss; but, I venture to state, not without confidence of its meeting with general assent, that this change in the mind of the nation has not been favourable to the House of Commons, both sides of which united have not now to boast that warmth of popular attachment which each side before possessed. Another consequence of this change, is, that the dis-

contents of the nation do not now, as formerly, operate in a partial direction. It is not upon a part of the House; it is not upon this or that ministry, that the blame now falls; but upon the whole House, and upon all public men: a consideration of great moment, when we consider the crisis in which we now live, and as to the final event of which so much must depend upon the conduct, and, of course, upon the opinions of the people, supposing, which we must, in this case, suppose, that the people will still remain free. Formerly what was disliked by the nation was, by one half of the nation, imputed to one half of the parliament and one half of the public men. Hope was kept alive in the other half, and resentment was counterbalanced by hope. This is no longer the case. There are still persons wishing for a change of ministry, because there are always persons who wish to obtain possession of power and emolument; but, beyond that circle, which, though extensive, is nothing when compared to a whole nation, there are very few persons indeed to be found who have even a wish upon the subject, and absolutely none at all, who sincerely believe that such a change would be attended with any substantial national benefit.

It has long been the opinion of many, that the present state of the representation is such as to leave the people little or no check upon their rulers. Since the year 1780, when the late Pitt and the late Duke of Richmond were the partizans of reform of parliament, this subject has become very familiar to the public. Those who deny the necessity of reform have not, as far as I have observed, actually justified the public advertising of *Seats for sale*; but, they have contended, that the House of Commons, constituted as it is, is quite sufficient for all the purposes for which the constitution intended such a House; and that, though it does happen, somehow, or other, that every ministry, as long as they remain in place; that every set of men, who are the servants of the king, have a majority in that House, and do carry every question that they please to carry, if it be of any importance to them, or to the crown; though this be allowed, still it is contended, that somehow or other, the representation is a sufficient check upon the power of the crown. In opposition to this doctrine of invisible influence, of effects without causes, and of causes without effects, various instances might be quoted, wherein the power of

the crown has been suffered to bear down all before it. But there has been no occasion since the reign of James II, on which the personal interests of any part of the family of the king have been so directly brought within the scope of parliamentary power, as the interests of the Duke of York now are ; and, therefore, now, more clearly than upon any former occasion, the people have had, and will have, an opportunity of ascertaining the degree of power which the House of Commons possesses independent of the Crown.

The long and expensive and bloody war, in which we are engaged, and to which no man can see the prospect of a termination, has caused an extension of the taxing system, almost beyond the compass of an ordinary mind's conception. In answer to all our complaints on this score, we are told, that the burthens are necessary to preserve us against the inroads of the enemy. The argument, carried out to its full length, is this : If you do not give the king the means of keeping up an immense fleet and army, Napoleon will conquer the country and will make you more miserable than you now are. As to the words, loss of our *constitution*, and making us *slaves*, we will lay them aside for the present, as not being definite enough for any six men to come to an agreement about their meaning. By the necessity of sacrifices for our own good, we must understand it to be meant, that Napoleon, were he to become our master, would make our situation worse than it is under the sovereignty of the family of Brunswick ; for, unless this be the case ; unless this be the jet of the argument, there is no motive for our resistance, and, of course, none for the sacrifices which we make, and which, by law, we are compelled to make, in order to render that resistance efficient. For, as to *loyalty*, it is an empty sound, unconnected with the general good. Kings, like other individuals, have their personal friends ; but personal friendship for a king forms no ingredient of loyalty, which means fidelity to the king as *king* ; as the guardian of the nation's interest, honour, and renown. Subjects in general know nothing of the king but through the laws, and every man, as long as he obeys those laws, is a loyal man, whatever may be his opinion or his feelings with regard to the person, or the family, of the king. Thus, then, it is, I think, evident, that the motive to resist Napoleon, and to make sacrifices for that purpose, will, at last, come to this : to save ourselves from being in a worse situa-

tion than we are in under the family of Brunswick. Amongst the means, are of course, the keeping of the family of Brunswick upon the throne ; maintaining all the just prerogatives of the king, and the like ; but the great end in view, is to prevent ourselves from being made worse off than we now are. Well then, this being the case, let us examine, a little, how we should be worse off ! And here it must be first observed, that “ *we*,” thus used, does not apply to a few thousands of courtiers and placemen and pensioners, for, if it did, no examination would be necessary. It applies to the whole of *fourteen millions of people*. He would, it is said, take away our property ; but, what would he do with it ? He could not carry the land to France, nor the goods ; nor could he take from the land its productive quality ; nor could he unstring the arms of a labourer ; nor would it be his *interest* so to do. No, it is not in *this way* that we should experience much of a change, the manifest interest of the conqueror being to leave the people in general, in the possession and enjoyment of all the property in land and in trade, that they now possess and enjoy. But, without supposing a danger to property, there is quite a sufficient motive for resisting Napoleon, and for making *any* sacrifices that are *really* necessary for that purpose. There is no doubt, that, if he were to succeed in the conquest of England, he would treat us as a conquered people ; he would take from us our laws, and give us his edicts in their stead ; he would rule us as an absolute monarch ; his soldiers would be our masters under him ; and we should not dare to complain of any act of his, however oppressive, or however insolent. Yet, notwithstanding this powerful motive to resistance, it is necessary that the people of this country should be convinced ; that they should see, daily, proofs, of the value of what they now possess ; that they should be able to draw a triumphant contrast between what now is, and what would be in case they were conquered by Napoleon ; that they should want no one to tell them, that their *constitution* is worth being defended with their last shilling, and the last drop of their blood ; that they should feel this from the bottom of their hearts ; that they should stand no more in need of being reminded of it, than they do of being reminded of the necessity of eating when they are hungry, or drinking when they are thirsty.

Now, connecting these more general

observations with the subject immediately under contemplation, is it not, with a view to the stability of the throne as well as to the permanent internal peace and happiness of the country, a thing of vast importance, that the decision, upon the case of the Duke of York, should be such as to convince the whole nation, that they have now got; that they possess and enjoy, a system of government, the loss of which would be greatly injurious to them? Is it not of incalculable consequence, that every man should, by this decision, be induced to exclaim: "What would have been the proceedings and what the decision, if Napoleon had been our master, and if one of his relations had been thus accused?" The mere circumstance of there being a House of Commons now, and of its being possible that there would be none then, is nothing at all. It is the real effect which only is worthy of attention. Napoleon has his *Corps Legislatif* in France. It is the power which this body possesses, not in theory, but in *practice*, which we are to look to. It is not what it might do, but what it actually does do, that we are to consider. Men do not give their money, or lay down their lives, for a theory. When we are called upon to spend our last shilling and to shed the last drop of our blood in defence of the constitution, it surely never is meant, that we should do this for something theoretical; for a thing that exists in name only! No, but a thing which is our shield against oppression; a thing that secures justice to us; a thing necessary, in short, to our safety and happiness; and, therefore, upon this occasion, where the constitution is to be *put to the test*, it is of the greatest consequence, with an eye to the future as well as the present, that it should stand that test; that it should give proofs of its excellence; that its practice, upon this great occasion, should give the lie to all its enemies. There is nothing which mankind in general dislike so much as partiality in the administration of justice; there is nothing so grating to the mind. As justice is the first attribute of power, so the abuse and perversion of its name and its forms are amongst the wickedest, if not the very wickedest, acts, of which a government can be guilty. When we would give instances of the badness of a government, we are sure to wind up the climax of its sins by saying, that it has one law for the rich and another law for the poor:

"Law grinds the poor, and rich men rule the law,"

forms the close of a long list of national evils, the cause of national degradation and ruin. Partiality even in the distribution of *favours*, when those favours are paid for by the public, is mischievous and hateful enough; but, not a millionth part so mischievous and so hateful, so detestable in the eyes of every just man, and of virtue, as partiality in the distribution of *punishments*. It is mortifying enough in all conscience to see the parasite pampered with the means of rewarding the meritorious; but, to see the great villain brav ing the laws, while the petty are hanged in chains, is what no man can bear without feeling a desire to see overturned, torn up from the foundation, utterly destroyed and scattered to the winds, the whole of the system and fabric of that government, where such partiality has proceeded. I state this as a general proposition; I say it merely by way of illustration, and not at all in allusion to the case of the Duke of York, or to any anticipated decision of the House of Commons; but, on the contrary, with a confident hope and reliance, that the decision of that House will be strictly just; and, that the House will now prove to the world, that it is not to be swayed, on the one side or the other, by any influence but that which fairly and obviously arises from the evidence taken at its bar.

I presume not to dictate to the House; I presume not to say, what ought to be the substance of its decision, or the mode of its proceedings, on this momentous case; and, indeed, what I am now writing cannot be read by the public 'till after the discussion and the decision have taken place; but, I cannot refrain from offering my opinion, as to the *importance* of the case. It is a thing not to be disguised, that the present situation of the throne, in this country, has in its circumstances very peculiar, to describe them by no epithet of more strong or distinct meaning. In the natural course of things it must require great wisdom at the head of affairs to prevent those circumstances from having an injurious operation towards the throne itself. It has been observed, that long and quiet reigns have, almost always, been followed by times of a different description. The reasons for this are obvious enough to the reflecting mind; and, when we consider the peculiar circumstances, above alluded to, taking into view the general degradation of royalty upon the continent, it is impossible not to be impressed with very serious thoughts with

respect to our own prospects in this particular. From the first, I was of opinion, that wise counsellors would avoid every thing which was likely to give rise to a belief, that the king, or any part of the royal family, wished to use any endeavours whatever to obstruct the course of justice; because, if the people, who would not fail to be extremely jealous upon that score, once imbibed a suspicion of the sort, it would be very hard to remove it, and the consequence of its remaining in their minds is too manifest to need pointing out. Whether the king's ministers have so acted, I must leave the public to judge; but, I am sure, that if all wisdom has not fled from their counsels, they will so act now, now when all the evidence is before the public, and when the only point, of any interest, that remains, is, to know how the ministers, how *the advisers of the king* and their friends in the House of Commons will act.

It is the habit of courtiers and men in power to regard as their enemy, and, what is more, as the enemy of the existing government altogether, every one who opposes any of their measures, or censures any part of their conduct. It is their creed, and that all those, who wish to gain or preserve their friendship, well know; and know it so well, that they are sure never to hear a painful truth from their lips. All those who praise them are friends, all who censure are enemies, of the government. Hence it is, that they never take warning in time; and hence the fall of so many governments and dynasties; a fall sudden to them, but long foreseen and foretold by others. With all the talk about "a conspiracy" in this country, not the smallest proof, not the most distant ramification, has been found during the whole of the long and rummaging inquiry, that has just taken place. But, if there be any such conspiracy; if there be any set of men in this kingdom, who wish to see the House of Commons held in universal contempt, trodden down, and spit upon, and along with it the kingly government and royal family; if there be any such men, the first wish of their hearts must be, that the conduct of the House of Commons should, on this trying occasion; on this occasion when every man in the country is in possession of all the merits of the case, and has his eyes fast fixed upon the House, be marked with that base partiality, which, more than any thing else, excites the hatred and resentment of mankind, and of which, I trust,

their conduct will not bear the smallest trace. Men, in possession of power, are too apt to rely wholly upon the means which that power affords them, for the preservation of the power itself. But, that which is not to be accomplished to-day, may be to-morrow. A thousand unexpected events take place in the course of a few years. Few important effects have been produced by one cause, and still fewer have immediately followed the first existence of its real cause or causes. The match is all that meets the eye; but, the match is not the great efficient cause of the explosion and destruction. A government to be suddenly destroyed, must have a people well-prepared; amply charged with mortifications and heartburnings. If, therefore, the king's ministers are wise; if their love of their country; their regard for their master; and their desire to preserve the throne, be as great as they ought to be, they will not, in the approaching discussion and decision, make use of any influence, other than that of truth, fairly applied. They should bear in mind, they should never lose sight of the fact; that they are *the servants of the king*, with this additional and peculiar circumstance, that they came into power, that they were chosen by the king, for this reason openly avowed, that *they would do*, at his request, what his late ministers *would not do*. It becomes them, therefore, to be doubly cautious upon this particular occasion. Their conduct, whether good or bad, and I do not presume it will be the latter, will admit of, and will receive, a very wide construction and application; they will now, the day after to-morrow (this is Monday), do more good, or more harm, to the government of England, than all the ministers, for a century past, have had it in their power to do.

With what will be done on Wednesday I cannot become acquainted many hours before this sheet will be in the press; but, these observations I have thought it my duty to offer to my readers, and there is, perhaps, an advantage in their having been written while the event, to which they relate, was, as yet, unknown.

---

I shall now return to my Analysis of the Cases; and, for this week, shall take those cases, which appear to me to be of the most importance, as connected with the conduct of the *king's servants* in the House of Commons. I allude particularly to the cases of SAXON and CLAVERING, and shall begin with the former.

## CAPT. SANDON'S CASE.

I do not mean his case, or any of his cases, as a jobber, but solely as the possessor of the paper, which was attempted to be made out a *forgery*, which, of the whole of the very interesting proceedings, is certainly the most interesting of all, involving a greater number of persons, and making greater and more clear disclosures as to transactions and motives, which it appears to have been intended to keep from the world.—On the 16th of February, when all the cases had been gone through, as far as Mr. Wardle appears to have intended to go at that time, Mr. Perceval, the king's principal servant in the House of Commons, stated to the House, with a most solemn and pompous introduction, that he was in possession of *a fact*, which he had known of for ten days, and which, he was sure, when it was heard, it would be the general opinion, that it ought to be made known. It was the wish of his royal highness, that it should be made known to the committee, the *time* being left to his (Mr. Perceval's) discretion. The fact, the important fact, was this; that, in the case of Major Tonyn, *a material point in the evidence had been suppressed*.—Now, we must take the report of Mr. Perceval's speech; and I do beseech the reader to pay attention to it; I do beseech him to weigh well every sentence, as he proceeds; for he will find, in the end, that this is the very pivot upon which no small part of the merits of the whole case turns. —“Mr. Perceval said the fact to which “he alluded was of the utmost import- “ance, and though it had not yet been “made known to the House generally, it “was well known to many hon. gentlemen “on both sides, not only among his friends, “but among those who acted with the hon. “gent., who brought forward this charge. “He had been acquainted with it for “ten days, but for the reasons he would “hereafter assign, had thought it right not “to bring it forward till after the evidence “was closed. He was sure when it was “heard, it would be the general opinion “that it ought to be made known. It “was the wish of his royal highness the “Commander in Chief that it should be “communicated to the Committee; the “proper time to do so being left to his “(Mr. Perceval's) discretion, so that if “any blame was due for the delay, that “blame was his. The fact to which he al- “luded was, the suppression of material “evidence in one of the cases before the “Committee (Major Tonyn's), which as

“it now stood was as follows, (here the “right hon. gent. stated the evidence of “Mrs. Clarke, Mr. Donovan, and Capt. “Sandon, in this case, particularly of the “latter, which related to the interview he “had with Major Tonyn, who wanted his “money returned, when he persuaded “him to let the matter rest for a short “time, to see whether or not his promo- “tion was gazetted). He could not ex- “plain the matter he now wished to bring “forward, better than by relating what “had happened. On Saturday se'night “Col. Hamilton called upon him with a “letter from Mr. Adam, saying he had “business of importance to communicate. “The communication was to this effect, “that on their arrival from Spain, (Col. “Hamilton and Capt. Sandon were in the “Waggon Train), Capt. Sandon had made “him acquainted with circumstances which “were very material to the investigation “now before the House. When Capt. “Sandon was called to the Bar, he was “desired to inform them of all he knew “on the subject, which he had done with “this exception—he had suppressed the “fact that when Capt. Tonyn had pressed “him for a return of his 500 guineas, he “acquainted Mrs. Clarke with the cir- “cumstance, who told him to go back to “Capt. Tonyn with a note, purporting to “be written by the Duke of York, in “these words: “I have received your “note, and Tonyn's business shall remain “as it is.” This note was shewn to Capt. “Tonyn in order to convince him that “Mrs. Clarke and Sandon possessed the “influence they pretended to, and that “the promotion would remain as it was, “unless he suffered the money to remain “to purchase their exertion. Another “note, also purporting to be written by “his royal highness, was sent on the day “when Major Tonyn was gazetted, in “these words—“Tonyn will be gazetted “to night.” When making this disclosure “to Col. Hamilton, Sandon said he might “destroy this paper, on which Col. Ha- “milton told him by no means to do that, “but to go to the bar and tell the whole “truth, pointing out at the same time, the “danger he would incur in telling any “falshoods. The latter note had been “delivered to Tonyn. Col. Hamilton, as “advised by Mr. Adam, after giving him “this information, went back to Capt. San- “don, repeated his injunctions as to the “line of conduct he ought to pursue, and “got a copy of the first note. Col. “Hamilton also advised him not to at-

"tend either to Mr. Lowten, or Mrs. Clarke and Mr. Wardle, who had sent "for him on his arrival in town, to undergo an examination previous to his being examined at the bar, but to keep aloof from all parties. After some consultation, it was resolved that Mr. Adam should inform his royal highness of this circumstance, that we, as members of parliament and judges in this case, could not be made depositaries of it, but that it must be made public, and that Col. Hamilton should again visit Capt. Sandon, and discover whether, as a strong impression had been made on his mind, the note really was in the hand-writing of the Duke of York. Mr. Adam had accordingly waited on his royal highness, who on being told of the circumstance, expressed himself convinced, that the note must be a forgery, and wished extremely that the matter should be thoroughly examined into. As for the note respecting the gazetting, his royal highness could not positively say it might not be his, as he would have written such an answer to any letter making an enquiry on the subject. The next day (Sunday) Col. Hamilton saw Capt. Sandon, who said to him, ' You will be very angry with me, for since you saw me, I have destroyed the Note.' 'Good God!' exclaimed Col. H. you have not surely done any thing so rash.'—It was not of so much consequence (returned Capt. Sandon), and besides they have forgot it.' He had thus submitted to the House all he knew of this important affair. The destruction of the note rested on Capt. Sandon's word. If it was still in existence, and could be proved a forgery, it would shew how people had been imposed upon by Mrs. Clarke and her agents; while on the other hand, if proved to be the hand-writing of the Duke of York, it would be necessary to call on his royal highness to explain how it happened.—After some general concluding observations, he moved to call in Capt. Sandon." — After this Sandon was called to the bar. But, before we proceed any further, I ask the reader, the impartial man, whether it does not strike him as something singular, that Col. Hamilton should go to *Mr. Adam?* Perhaps not; but was it not odd, that Mr. Adam should send him (*with a letter*) to *Mr. Perceval*, instead of to Mr. Wardle? Why, that may not be so very unaccountable. But, how can you account, Reader, for Mr.

Perceval's keeping the matter, a matter so very important, from *Mr. Wardle?* From Mr. Wardle, and from the House in general? He told it to Mr. Whitbread and Lord Henry Petty and General Fitzpatrick; but, he did not tell it to *Mr. Wardle, or to Lord Folkestone*, though it related to evidence the most material that could possibly be conceived to exist.—Sandon was now called in, and being questioned about the existence of the Note, prevaricated in so flagrant a manner, that he was committed to Newgate; but previous to that, the Serjeant at Arms was sent with him to his house, whence the original of the Note, together with many other papers, were brought, and delivered to the House.—Mrs. Clarke having, in the absence of Sandon, been questioned as to the giving, or sending to Sandon, any note in the hand writing of the Duke of York, says that she does not recollect the Duke's writing any note to her upon the subject, and that none was necessary, because he saw her every day of his life at that time; and, she states, that she never either gave or sent any such note to Sandon, because she was so very careful not to let any of the Duke's writing go out of her hands.—After Sandon came back with the note, he was examined again, and, in this examination, he said that Mrs. Clarke had given him the note to be shown to Tonyn, in order to pacify him, and to prevent him from withdrawing his money.—Then Mrs. Clarke (who, the reader will observe, had been kept from all knowledge of what was going forward), was called in again. The note, addressed to "*George Farquhar, Esq.*" was shewn her, in these words. "*I have just received Your Note, and Tonyn's business shall remain as it is—God bless you.*"—She was then questioned as follows:

Do you recollect ever seeing that paper before?—I suppose I must have seen it before, for it is his royal highness's writing.

What reason have you to suppose you have seen it before?—I do not know how it could have got into that man's possession unless I gave it to him, and it was a direction I used very often to get from his royal highness, "*George Farquhar, Esq.*"

Do you now recollect having given to Capt. Sandon a letter upon this subject?—No, I do not, nor do I recollect giving him that; but I think I must have given it to him, because it must have been in my possession first.

After this, she was questioned a good deal,

as to whether she always wrote the same hand; whether she had never imitated other people's hands; and the like; and her answers were, that she had, with other women, in laughing, imitated the hands of various persons; but that she never in her life wrote any thing to send out as another's writing.—One Town, a Jew, who had been employed by her in the capacity of a painter on velvet, was brought, and said, that he had seen Mrs. Clarke imitate the Duke's signature, but could not recollect, whether it was in the word Frederick, York, or Albany. He said, that Mrs. Clarke told him she could *forgo* the Duke's name, and had done it; and that when he told her it was a "*serious affair*," she laughed. He said, that he first mentioned this matter to *Lady Haggerstone* (a sister, I believe, of *Mrs. Fitzherbert*), and that he supposes she mentioned it somewhere, and that, therefore, he was called up to give evidence.—From a subsequent examination of this man, on the 20th of Feb. he denied that an indictment for perjury, at the Middlesex Sessions, was hanging over his head; but, acknowledged that Mr. Alley had made use of strong language towards him; and that either his sister or his brother was now under some proceeding of the sort.—After this the note, the dear little "*God-bless-you*" billet, was shown to Col. Gordon, who said, "it bore a very strong resemblance to the Duke's writing, but whether it was so or not, he could not positively state." Upon further questioning, he said, that, if he had received a note in that writing, he should, if it had the Duke's signature, have acted upon it.—*General Hope* said, that it appeared to him like the hand writing of the Duke; but whether it really was so or not, he could not undertake to say.—*General Brownrigg* did not think it very like the Duke's writing.—*Mr. Adam* did think it like the Duke's hand writing, but could not speak more positively than that.—Five persons, from the Post-office and the Bank, whose profession it had been, for years, to compare hands writing, with a view of detecting frauds and forgeries, were examined, on the 20th of Feb.; and, let it be observed, that they were called in upon motion of one of the king's servants, Mr. Pereeval.—The first, *Mr. Johnson*, from the Post-office, upon being shown the two letters of the Duke, about O'Meara and Clavering, and also the note, and after having had time to examine and compare them well, was asked, whether he thought the note to be in the same hand writing

as the letters, to which he answered: "It resembles it so nearly that I should think it was."—*Mr. Searle*, from the same office, being asked the same question, answers: "I think they are the same hand writing."—*Mr. Nesbitt*, from the Bank, was of opinion, "that they were not in the same hand writing."—*Mr. Bateman*, from the Bank, says "there is a marked similarity," and that, if two instruments had come before him, one in the character of the Letters, and one in the character of the Note, "he thinks he should have passed them as the same."—*Mr. Bliss*, from the Bank, first answered, that "he should suppose the hand writing to be the same;" but afterwards said, that he had some doubts, owing to certain letters that he had since seen in the hand writing of Mrs. Clarke, which varied a good deal from other letters of hers.—Now, we must go back, and, beginning with the evidence of Col. Hamilton of the Waggon Train, trace this curious proceeding down to the moment, when Mr. Perceval drew out, and, as it were, discharged the important discovery upon the House.—Col. Hamilton says, that he had no idea of a forgery, for he thought the note to be in the hand writing of the Duke of York; that he has frequently seen letters which he supposed, of course, to be the Duke's writing; that he went to Mr. Adam, because he had long known him to be a very honourable man; that he did not go to Mr. Wardle, because he was not acquainted with him; that he took a copy of the note at the request of Mr. Adam; that, afterwards, when Sandon told him he had destroyed the note, he went and informed Mr. Adam of that too; that, upon the 16th of Feb. some time in the afternoon of the day when Sandon was committed for prevarication, Sandon informed him, that he had not destroyed the note; that, upon finding this to be the case, he went and informed Messrs. Adam and Lowten and Harrison of the fact; that he is not quite certain that he did mention it to Mr. Adam, but that he certainly desired Mr. Harrison (the Horse-Guards lawyer) to mention it to Mr. Adam.—This brings us down to the evening of Sandon's commitment, and to the conduct of the friends of the Duke on that memorable evening.—*Mr. Harrison* being called in, said, that he, who was employed as a lawyer, in military matters, at the office of the Duke of York, the War-office, and the Barrack-office, had been desired to attend and give his assistance with Mr. Lowten, during the inquiry; that Col. Hamil-

ton told him, on the 16th, that *the note was not destroyed*; that immediately upon that, he came to the House, and, as he thinks, informed Mr. Huskisson of the fact; and that he gave this information before Mr. Perceval made his speech about the supposed forgery.—Mr. *Huskisson* (who was one of the persons in the original secret), says that he, upon receiving the information from Mr. Harrison, communicated it to Mr. Perceval.—But, now we must take the examinations of Messrs. Perceval and Adam from the Minutes, published by the House; for they are of a degree of importance, which leaves almost all the others far out of sight. But, we must first take their Evidence of Monday, the 20th of Feb. and then come to that of Wednesday, the 22nd of Feb.—Let the reader pay attention to every single word of it.

#### *Examination of the 20th.*

M.R. ADAM.

When did you first hear of the note in the possession of Capt. Sandon?—On Saturday morning, *the 4th of this month*, between 10 and 11 o'clock.

From whom did you hear of it?—I heard of it from Col. Hamilton; Col. Hamilton came to my house on Saturday morning, between 10 and 11 o'clock, before I was out of my bed.

State to the Committee what passed upon that occasion.—Col. Hamilton came to my house between 10 and 11 on Saturday morning, and was shewn up to me. He immediately mentioned to me that he had seen Capt. Sandon at Portsmouth; that Capt. Sandon had communicated with him upon the subject of this Inquiry; he said, that Capt. Sandon had asked him how he should conduct himself; that he had told Capt. Sandon that there could be no rule for his conduct, but one, which was to adhere strictly to truth, to tell every thing he knew, that it would not at all avail him to do otherwise, even if he should have an inclination, because he would be examined, I think he said, by the united ability of the country. He then told me, that Capt. Sandon told him that he had some letters upon the subject of his transactions with Mrs. Clarke, and that he had a note, which is the note in question, *which he believed to be in the Duke of York's hand-writing*; that that note he had shewn to Capt. Tonyn before he was made Major Tonyn, in order to induce him either to keep the deposit which he had made, or to replace the deposit which he had made, I cannot exactly recollect which; that deposit he had threatened to withdraw in consequence

of the delay between the first interview he, Capt. Sandon, had with Capt. Tonyn, on the subject of his promotion, which he represented, I think, as being nearly two months; that there was likewise another note, which note had been delivered, as he stated, to Major Tonyn, which was a note saying he was to be gazetted to-night, or in words to that effect. Col. Hamilton told me he had given strict injunctions to Capt. Sandon to preserve the note which he represented as in the Duke of York's hand-writing, and which I understand now to be the note about which there has been so much inquiry here, the original of which has been produced, and every paper. I said to Col. Hamilton, that nothing could be more correct than his instruction; that it still remained to be seen what the terms of the note were, and to be judged of whether it was the Duke of York's hand-writing; I desired Colonel Hamilton, therefore, to go to Capt. Sandon, and to desire to look at the note, *and to take a copy of it*, and to repeat his injunctions in the strongest manner, to preserve all the papers, and among the rest the note. Col. Hamilton returned to my house, I think it must have been considerably before 1 o'clock; it was after 12 or about 12; he told me, that he had repeated those instructions, that he had taken a copy of the note, which he brought to me, which I perused, and found to be in the very terms of the note which has been since produced; and he added, that *according to his opinion and belief, it was the Duke of York's hand-writing*. I then told him that such circumstances must be immediately communicated, and I wished him, therefore, to go to Mr. Perceval, with a note which I wrote, and that I would follow as soon as I could. Col. Hamilton went to Mr. Perceval, which I know, because I found him there, and had told Mr. Perceval the story before I arrived. Mr. Perceval and myself deliberated upon the course to be taken, and having understood from Col. Hamilton's representations (for I believe neither of us ever saw Capt. Sandon till he came to the Bar of this House) that Capt. Sandon had been applied to by Mrs. Clarke, and I think he said Mr. Wardle, but I will not be sure, and Mr. Lowten, to go to them, it was Mr. Perceval's suggestions, and my own, I believe mutually almost, that the most advisable course for us to direct Colonel Hamilton to take, was to instruct Captain Sandon to hold *no further communication with any person whatever till he appeared at*

*the Bar of this House*, and likewise to instruct him, to preserve the note and all the papers he had spoken of. Col. Hamilton received those instructions at Mr. Perceval's house, and went, as I presumed, to make the communication immediately to Capt. Sandon, which was to be done before 2 o'clock, because Sandon had promised, as we understood from Col. Hamilton, to give his answers, to the persons who had desired to see him, at that hour. After having given these directions to Col. Hamilton, it was agreed by Mr. Perceval and myself, that this matter *ought to be communicated to the Duke of York*, and it was further agreed by us, that the matter should be brought before the House of Commons by us, in case it did not make its appearance in the evidence of Capt. Sandon. I went in search of his royal highness, but it was the evening before I saw him; I communicated the matter to him, he expressed his surprise and astonishment, and declared the *impossibility* of his ever having made any such communication, and wished immediately to go to Mr. Perceval; we went to Mr. Perceval's together, where he made a *similar asseveration*, and again at Col. Gordon's. I did not see his royal highness again till between 3 and 4 on Sunday the 5th, and I did not see Col. Hamilton until Sunday at 1 o'clock, when I saw him for the purpose of learning whether he had executed the delivering the instructions to Capt. Sandon in the manner that Mr. Perceval and myself had required; Col. Hamilton told me that he had delivered them in the very terms; that Capt. Sandon had said, that he, Col. Hamilton, might depend upon his, Capt. Sandon's, obeying his instructions; but that he would be extremely angry with him, or extremely enraged with him, I am not sure which was the expression, for he had already disobeyed one of his instructions, *he had destroyed the note*; upon which, according to Col. Hamilton's representation, he said, Good God, have you destroyed the note? Of course I expressed myself to a similar effect to Col. Hamilton when he made the communication to me respecting the destruction of the note. I went to Mr. Perceval, according to appointment made the day before, and communicated to him this fact, as stated by Col. Hamilton; this became again the *subject of our deliberations*, and we *again determined* that it was our duty, as *Members of Parliament*, to bring the matter forward, leaving it to ourselves to judge in some measure, with

regard to the *time* of bringing it forward; and in order that there might not be a *possibility* of supposing that we brought it forward or kept it back according to circumstances, it was determined to make the communication to certain *Members of this House*. Accordingly the facts, as I have now stated them, were communicated to Lord Castlereagh, to Mr. Canning, to the Attorney and Solicitor General, to Lord H. Petty, to Mr. Whitbread, and to Gen. Fitzpatrick. This brings the fact down to the transaction in this House.

When you stated the circumstance of this note to the Duke of York, did the Duke state that he never had written such a note with a view of influencing Captain Tonyn, as it has been represented by Capt. Sandon, or that he had never written such a note at all to Mrs. Clarke?—The Duke of York stated, that he was *perfectly sure* that he had never written such a note; that he had not a recollection of it at all.

Did he state to you, that he had never written to Mrs. Clarke upon the subject of military affairs?—He always stated to me, that, to the best of his recollection, he had never written to Mrs. Clarke on the subject of military affairs, and that, if he had done it, it must have been *very rarely*.

Have you any objection to state what were the grounds of your withholding this communication from the House till the period it was brought forward?—The ground that influenced my mind was, that I thought if the communication had been brought forward at an earlier period, it might have embarrassed the course of proceeding in the Inquiry, at the instance of the gentleman who had set it on foot, and that, in considering the whole circumstances of the case, justice would be better obtained, whatever the effect of that note might be, by keeping it back till the period when it was allowed to transpire. I can only say now what were my motives and reasons for that conduct; that was what influenced me in the opinion I gave in consultation with Mr. Perceval upon that subject. I mentioned that I did not see the Duke again till three or four o'clock on Sunday; at one o'clock on Sunday I was informed, by Col. Hamilton, of Sandon's having declared the note to be destroyed. Between three and four o'clock on Sunday I informed the Duke of York of that fact. I think it right to state that as a material fact in the case.

You have stated, that one motive which you had for keeping back the mention of this note to so late a period, was, lest you should embarrass the gentleman who

brought forward this inquiry, by the premature disclosure of the note; explain to the Committee how that disclosure would have embarrassed him more than the cross-examinations which took place, when the Witnesses appeared at the Bar?—I considered this note, and the transaction respecting it, the disclosure respecting its destruction, to form one of the most extraordinary features that I had ever known of in any case. If I had been in the course of examining Witnesses much in this proceeding, I should have avoided cross-examining to that fact, thinking the mode that was adopted a more satisfactory means of bringing it forward; and I believe it will be found, that there was no cross-examination of Sandon to that fact, nor any thing that could lead to it; and therefore, answering to the motive, and not to the fact, I can only say it does not strike me that this stands upon the same footing as the ordinary cross-examination of Witnesses, according to my conception.

Why should its being an extraordinary feature prevent its being presented at an early period; is it usual for extraordinary features to be kept back in evidence in Courts of Justice, when they relate to the evidence that witnesses examined in chief, are giving to the Court?—I conceive, that being possessed of a fact of this sort, which I found it my bounden duty, in conjunction with Mr. Perceval, to bring before the public, whatever its consequences might be, and which the Royal Duke, I believe, had expressed a desire to Mr. Perceval, should be brought before the public, that I had a right to exercise my discretion, in conjunction with Mr. Perceval, to bring it before the public at the time that, according to that discretion, we should think the best, meaning honestly and distinctly at all times, to bring it before the House.

You have stated, that you thought that the purposes of justice would be best answered by not bringing this fact before the House sooner than it was brought; will you explain how the purposes of justice were likely to be best answered by the delay in bringing forward the circumstances respecting this note?—I can only state how I think the purposes of justice would be best answered; I cannot be so presumptuous as to say that the purposes of justice were best answered, but in my opinion they were, because it brought this particular feature of the case distinctly, clearly, and unembarrassed, before the House; that if it had been mixed up in cross-examination, or brought forward in that shape, it nei-

ther would have appeared so distinct, nor have appeared so clearly the determination of the persons bringing it forward.

MR. PERCEVAL examined.

Have you heard the statement of the hon. gent. lately under examination, and do you wish to add any thing to that statement?—I am not quite certain that I heard the whole. If it is wished that I should state the motives that influenced my mind, not in keeping this back, but in not bringing it forward before, I conceived the case that was to be made against the Royal Duke was closed. When the communication was made to me, I thought at the first it was a very extraordinary circumstance; and when I found that the note was, as the Witness represented it, destroyed, coupled with the direct assertion of the Royal Duke, that this note was a forgery, I thought it to be a forgery, and I determined to act upon the supposition of its being such, and upon that impression, and with a view the better to detect it, if it were so, I thought it better that all the Witnesses that could in any degree have been concerned in that transaction, should have told their own tale to the Committee, before they were in any degree informed, by me at least, or by the course that we took, of our being in possession of any fact, or inclined to make use of the information we had of any fact; it might break in upon their own plan of narrating it to the Committee; if it had been a single case, instead of a variety of cases, that were brought before the Committee, I apprehend that there could be no question; that on the part of the defence to that charge, those who interested themselves in the defence, could not be called upon to produce any part of the evidence which they thought material, till they had the whole of the case that was to be brought against them laid before the Court; and considering how the whole of these cases are, by means of the same Witnesses, more or less, being brought forward upon them all; considering from that circumstance how they were all connected, I conceived it would be better that this information should not be given till it was closed.

Was the introduction of this evidence settled, upon the supposition that the note was actually destroyed?—Certainly my impression was, that the note was actually destroyed, and it was after that impression was conveyed to me, that the note was actually destroyed, that I concurred with my hon. and learned friend in thinking that it was equally necessary that fact

should be brought before the Committee ; and perhaps I might be permitted to add, that, feeling there was *a considerable degree of awkwardness in the appearance of being backward* to bring forward at the earliest period a fact so important as this fact was, we did think that *our own honour would hardly be safe*, unless we made a communication not only of the fact, but of our determination to produce it in the manner in which we did.

This is very good, indeed. I beg every one to read it over twice, at least, every day for a month. If I had but a parrot, I would make her learn to say it over a thousand times a day.—Mind, they thought the note was *destroyed*, before they told any soul of its existence, except the *Lord Chancellor*.—Now, let us hear what they said on the 22nd of February.

#### *Examination of the 22nd.*

MR. PERCEVAL.

Would you wish to correct or alter any part of the evidence you gave on Monday, relative to this transaction ?—I do not recollect any part of the evidence I gave on Monday that I would wish to correct or alter; if the noble lord, in consequence of the information he has now collected, would wish to ask any other question, I will give an answer.

When you made the statement to this Committee, of the destruction of this note, had you heard that the note was not destroyed ?—When I made the statement to the Committee, I had received such a communication as my hon. friend has just mentioned, and I did in the statement that I made to the Committee, if my recollection does not extremely fail me, state that I did by no means know whether the note was destroyed or not, and that statement I certainly did make in consequence of the information I had but recently received, for, except from that recent information, I had strongly impressed upon my mind that the note was destroyed.

State who the persons were to whom you had given information respecting this note ?—I can state several, but I cannot undertake to be certain that I can state them all; I communicated it to the Solicitor General, to the Attorney General, to my Lord Castlereagh, to Mr. Canning, and I think I mentioned it to Mr. Yorke, and I am pretty confident that I mentioned it to others; I mentioned it likewise to the *Lord Chancellor*, I mentioned it to my *Lord Liverpool*, and I mentioned it to *Mr. Hus-*

*kisson* and *Mr. Long*, and they concurred in the opinion that *Mr. Adam* should communicate it to some friends of his on the other side of the House; and I believe that to every one of the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned, I did state at the same time my opinion, that from the first moment that I had heard of the existence of this note, I felt it to be my clear duty not to be the depository of such a secret; that I formed that opinion upon the first day that it was communicated to me, before I understood it to be destroyed, and that *as soon as I did know that it was destroyed*, which was the next day, I THEN communicated it to the different persons that I have mentioned, but I believe that no person did know of the existence of the note *till I heard it was destroyed*, except I believe the *Lord Chancellor*, when I had reason to believe it was in existence. Before I heard that it had been destroyed, I determined to communicate the fact, so that the note, if it was not destroyed, should be extracted by the evidence at the Bar; and when I heard that it was destroyed, I still continued to act upon upon that determination, and made that determination known. In the examination that I made of the witness (Sandon) at the Bar, I had in my mind, the whole time of that examination, the various points of fact which the witness had communicated to Col. Hamilton, and if the witness had not at last confessed that the note was not destroyed, I should, unquestionably, have asked him, whether he had not communicated to Col. Hamilton that very morning, that it was not destroyed.

Now, reader, you have the whole of the evidence, or, at least, all that is in any wise material, of this Case, fairly before you. It divides itself into two distinct branches; that which relates to the *origin of the note*, and that which relates to the conduct of those, who, being in early possession of the fact, *kept it from the House until so late a period*.—As to the first, there are only two persons, namely, General Brownrigg and Mr. Nesbit, who discover any dissimilarity at all, between the Duke's acknowledged hand writing, and the hand writing of the Note. Other evidence against the authenticity of the Note there is none; and it cannot have escaped the observation of any reader, that the manner, in which Mrs. Clarke gives her evidence relative to the Note, is strongly indicative of conscious truth.

As to what Town says, it amounts to nothing, even if there were no ground to doubt of his general veracity. It will be observed, too, that when a person *forges*, it is for some weighty purpose, and with a desire to make sure as to the effect. This Note, as evidence, is of great importance; but, as a thing intended for the purpose of pacifying Major Tonyn, it was very poor indeed. If Mrs. Clarke had thought it worth her while to forge, would she not have forged something more full and satisfactory? Would she not have put the Duke's *name*; and, above all things, would she not have forged an address to *herself*, and not to "*George Farquhar, Esqr.*?" How was Tonyn, the person to be imposed upon by the forgery, to know that this was the address, under which the Duke sent his letters to Gloucester Place?—Against the internal evidence of the hand writing, evidence quite sufficient, of itself, for conviction in the ordinary course of law, and evidence unshaken by any of another sort that has been produced; against this evidence, we have, indeed, the *positive assertion* of the Duke of York, conveyed to the House through Mr. Adam, which Duke of York solemnly avers, that he never, in his life, wrote any such note.—The reader will duly weigh the one against the other, and I have not the smallest doubt, that he will not be long in coming to a just conclusion.

But, important as this Note is, as matter of evidence; important as it evidently is in settling the point, whether the Duke had the "*slightest suspicion*," of jobbing for promotion being carried on by his mistress; still it is beyond all measure, more important, as having given rise to a series of actions, on the part of the king's servants and others, such as that which have been brought to light in the examinations of Mr. Perceval and Mr. Adam.—The facts speak so plainly for themselves, that no commentary, or summary, is necessary; but, I cannot refrain from giving a short view of the case.—On the 4th of Feb. we see Col Hamilton, of the Waggon Train; a person in the army, and in the receipt of a monstrous income from his office; in possession of the important fact, that Sandon has a note, *in the hand writing of the Duke* (for such Hamilton says he thought it), relating to the promotion of Major Tonyn, and said by Sandon to have been shown to Tonyn, in order to prevent him from withdrawing money

destined for Mrs. Clarke. This note was a thing of the very first importance; and Hamilton saying he so regarded it, went to communicate the knowledge of its existence to . . . . to whom? Not to Mr. Wardle; not to the gentleman who brought forward the charges; but, to Mr. Adam, the avowed, the gratuitous adviser, of the Duke of York.—Well, the fact, the important fact, is now in the breast of *a member of parliament*, of one of the *judges* in the case. And what does he do? Why, he sends Colonel Hamilton to . . . . to whom? Not to Mr. Wardle, not to the gentleman, who brought forward the charges, and who had the "*heavy responsibility*" of proving them hanging over his head; no, not to Mr. Wardle; but, to Mr. Perceval, one of the *servants of the king*.—Mr. Adam and Mr. Perceval (both members of parliament, both judges in the case) now hold a consultation, and what is the result of that consultation? Why, that Hamilton should advise Sandon to hold no communication with any other person till he came to the bar of the House; that the matter should be brought before the House of Commons; but, *first of all*, that it should be *communicated to the Duke of York*, to the party *accused*, by two of his *judges*, before it was communicated to the *House*, which was accordingly *done*.—Stop here, reader; pause a while; think well of this before you go any further. They thought it quite right to communicate this very important fact to the *accused*, though they tell you that they expressly advised that Sandon should keep it and every thing else from the *accuser*.—Oh! faith. I had like to have forgotten, that they charged Digby Hamilton; expressly charged Digby to tell Sandon to *preserve the note*; to be sure to *preserve* the note; not to fail to *preserve* the note, which Digby thought was in the Duke's hand writing. Digby was, indeed, to repeat all his own former salutary advice to Sandon, but was to be sure to tell him to *preserve*, that is to say, *not to destroy*, the note, which Digby Hamilton thought to be in the Duke's hand writing.—Alas! see how frail poor human nature is, and how unavailing, in certain cases, are all the precautions of wisdom. Digby comes to Mr. Adam, on the 5th of Feb. the very next day, with the sad tidings, that the note, the important note, is *destroyed*, and of his having exclaimed to Sandon: "Good God! have you destroyed the note?"—In to council again upon this. Away goes Mr. Adam to . . . . to Mr. Wardle?—No.

To the House? No. But to Mr. Perceval again. Again they deliberate, and again determine to bring the matter before the House; but reserving to *themselves* to judge of the proper time; but, in order that there may not be a possibility of supposing that they ever, in any case, meant to suppress it, they now determined to make the communication to certain members of the House. One of them made the communication to certain members of his side, and the other to certain members of his side; but, neither of them ever communicated it to any soul, except the Lord Chancellor, **TILL AFTER THEY BELIEVED THE NOTE TO HAVE BEEN DESTROYED.** Reader, write that fact up over your mantle piece. Read it a hundred times a day.

—Well, did they now communicate the important fact to Mr. Wardle? No. To Lord Folkestone? No, no; the *Accuser*; the person with “heavy responsibility” hanging over his head; the member to whom “infamy” was to attach, if he failed to prove his charges, had not the fact communicated to him.—At last the hour arrives; the fulness of time arrives, and the great fact of the *destroyed note*, the *suppressed evidence*, the *forgery*, is to be poured out upon the devoted heads of Mr. Wardle and Mrs. Clarke, when (as if the father of lies himself had exhausted his skill in vain upon Sandon) Mr. Adam and Mr. Perceval, but a few minutes before the statement is made, learn, and, doubtless, to their inexpressible satisfaction, that the note is *not destroyed*.

“ All ye gods, who rule the soul;  
“ Styx, through hell whose waters roll,” &c.

Well, in plain prose, out came the note; aye, the very identical note; the dear little “God-bless-you” billet; the sequel of which production, we have already seen.

—Now, then, I shall leave the reader to make up his mind upon this everlasting to be remembered transaction; and trouble him with only one observation, as to what would have been the consequence, if the Devil had insinuated into the mind of Sandon to destroy the note *in reality*. In that case, the flat denial of the Duke; his positive assertion; his solemn asseveration, that he had never written any such note, would have been placed, not in opposition to the hand writing of the note itself, as it now is, but in opposition to the bare assertion of Mrs. Clarke, which assertion would have come discredited by the very suspicious circumstance of her associate Sandon having destroyed the note, and

that, too, in direct opposition to the injunctions laid on him by the friends of the Duke, through Colonel Hamilton.

### DOCTOR O'MEARA'S CASE.

The case of General Clavering will require more room, than I have, at present, to spare; for, on various accounts, it is a case of primary importance. I shall, therefore, take the case of the Doctor, which lies in a smaller compass.—Mrs. CLARKE, in her evidence of the 9th of February, stated, amongst other things, that she was applied to for a *deanery* and a *bishoprick*. Having so said, she was, as usual, pressed on, with the apparent prospect of detecting her in falsehood, till she came to state the name of Dr. O'Meara, who applied to her to get him made a *Bishop*. At first, this fact rested upon her bare word; and, while that was the case, many persons disbelieved, or affected, at least, to disbelieve, her statement; but, as usual, this attempt to throw discredit upon her evidence only tended to put her upon her mettle; to set her to work to rummage out other testimony than her own.—She stated, on the 9th of February, that Dr. O'Meara, who wanted to be a Bishop, applied to her; that she communicated the Doctor's offer to the Duke of York, together with all the Doctor's documents; that the answer of the Duke was, that the Doctor had preached before the king, and that the king did not like the great O in his name; that she does not recollect the precise sum that the Doctor offered, but that she might recollect, though not at this moment; that the Doctor's application to her was made in 1805, the very night that the Duke was going to Weymouth; that the Doctor called upon her the moment the Duke had left the house, at midnight; that she thinks he must have watched the Duke out, as he had seen his horses waiting in Portman Square, and then, coming in just as she was upon the stairs, said it was a very good opportunity, for he was going to Weymouth immediately, and asked her to come down stairs again, and write him a *letter of introduction* to the Duke, which she did.—On the 13th of February, she brought to the bar a letter of the Duke of York, written to her from Weymouth, which letter tells her that Dr. O'Meara had applied to him (the Duke) in order to be allowed “to preach before royalty;” that he, the Duke, will put him in the way of it if he

can; and that, as the ground of this, the Doctor has delivered to him her letter.— Not content with this proof of her influence as well as of the intercourse, she rummages out a stray document of Dr. O'Meara, which had accidentally remained in her hands, which document is no less than a testimonial in favour of Dr. O'Meara under the hand of the *Archbishop of Tuam*, which testimonial states, that the writer has received satisfactory assurances, that the Doctor is “a gentleman of most unexceptionable character, in every respect, of ‘a respectable family, and independent fortune.’” — Thus the proof, in the Doctor's case, is quite complete, unless the reader should be of opinion, that the positive evidence, as to the fact of a tendered bribe, be not sufficiently corroborated by the letter of the Duke of York to Mrs. Clarke, and by the letter of the Archbishop of Tuam being found in her possession.— To the Doctor's case there hangs a tail, and for the sight of which tail, at the present moment, the public are indebted to the COURIER.— My Readers will not blame me for having been sparing in dissertations upon *puff's*. I have, not less than a hundred times, had to point out the shameful, the scandalous, the infamous deception of the people through the means of the press. The most complete puff I ever heard of, one that far surpasses any thing that Mr. Sheridan had an idea of when he wrote the Critic, or, to go still farther, any thing that either he or his son has ever practised in reality, was a puff of a Lord, who is now no more, and whose name I will not mention. This lord, who had written a pamphlet about Ireland, under a feigned name, and who was very anxious to get some employment under government, was continually puffing himself off in the newspapers, and at last, he got so completely the master of all inward shame, as to prepare, with his own hand, a paragraph in nearly these words: “While others, of comparatively trifling merit, are eternally thrusting themselves forward to public notice, and putting off their petty pretensions to place and power, it is Lord —'s lot, to do good by stealth, and blush to find it fame.” — Reader, do you not feel for the man? Can you conceive how a man could bear his existence, under the contemplation of such a paragraph, written with his own hand? Yet, I assure you, that the fact is as I have stated it.— From this we come to the famous puff of Dr. O'Meara, who did get in the way of “preaching before Royalty,” at Weymouth,

and who had no mind that the thing should remain unknown, as you will see when you have read the following article, inserted in the Morning Post, or Nabob's Gazette, under the head of Weymouth, Oct. 3, 1805.— “The Rev. Dr. O'Meara preached on Sunday an excellent Sermon (from Rom. ch. xii. v. 5.) on Universal Benevolence. He explained with great eloquence on the relation which the *public* and *private* affections bear to each other, and their use in the moral system.— He inveighed with peculiar energy against the Savage Philosophy of the *French Deists*, who propose to erect a System of Universal Philanthropy upon the ruins of the *private affections* which regard kindred, friends, benefactors and the poor, thus inverting the eternal order of Nature, by violently transferring all the lovely train of social affections from our relatives and friends to distant and unknown myriads. Whilst under these vague terms of attachment to, and of advancing the general good, the practice of every debasing vice finds a shelter, and the perpetration of every horrid crime a subterfuge.— We wish our young Ecclesiastics would arouse themselves, and shake off that mental languor which oppresses them in the pulpit, and shew themselves in earnest.— *Sacred Eloquence* is certainly in this Country feeble and unimpressive; no other excellence can supply the want of animation.— That sweet charm, that celestial unction, which Christian oratory demands, this Gentleman possesses in an eminent degree. ‘His lips are touched with the live Coal from off the Altar.’— The King was very attentive, and stood for nearly the whole of the sermon, (which we never observed before), and expressed his high approbation to the Earl of Uxbridge and others, whilst the Queen and Princesses, and the whole audience were melted into tears.” — “Now,” says the COCRIER, “connecting the application of Mrs. Clarke to the Duke in favour of Dr. O'Meara, with the Letter from the Duke, stating that he will endeavour to accomplish the Doctor's wish of preaching before Royalty, and the above sketch of the discourse which the Doctor did preach before Royalty, Mrs. Clarke will have the credit of having been the cause of a Sermon upon Universal Benevolence having been preached before the Royal Family, which produced a great effect upon the King, and melted the Queen and all the Princesses into tears.” — Amongst

other things, which the Conspiracy, the Jacobin Conspiracy, wishes to accomplish, is, we are told, the overthrow of the *Church*, including, of course, Doctor O'Meara, who possesses the *celestial unction*, and whose "lips are touched with the *live coal* from off "the altar;" aye, those very lips, through which had passed the offer to Mrs. Clarke. Why, John Bowles and Redhead Yorke may say what they please about "our "holy religion" being in danger from a Jacobin Plot; but, will they have the impudence to say, that transactions like these ought to be tolerated, let *what will* be the consequence of removing the means of their existing? Perhaps they will; but, they may be assured, that that impudence will only tend to hasten the cutting up of the corruptions.—Dean Swift gives us a caution against your gentry with "the "celestial unction;" and, it is no small compliment to the discernment of the king, that he was not to be imposed upon in this case; for, though he might express his objection merely to the great O, yet there is no doubt, that he saw the whole drift of the preacher, and pretty fairly estimated his character as well as his talents.—It should further be observed here, that the Duke does not speak with any great confidence even of being able to get the Doctor the opportunity to preach before the king. When it came *there*, the way was full of difficulty. The matter was delicate. *And this, in justice to the king*, the people should bear in mind.

#### MISS TAYLOR'S CASE.

And here I have to beseech the attention of the public, and the exercise of their best feelings, towards, and in behalf, of a person, who appears to me to merit not only their compassion, but their efficient protection.—The evidence, which she has given, is before them. They will have seen, that, from first to last, it was clear, precise, consistent, and bearing all the features of truth and honesty.—They will also have observed, that Mr. Wardle declared in the House, that, when he told her, he should want her evidence, she said, that, "if she told the truth, she knew "it would be to the ruin of herself and her "dearest connections, and that she hoped he "would not force her forwards."—After every effort that was made to find out grounds of imputation against her, it is

notorious that not the smallest grounds were discovered, and that while she stood ornamented with truth and sensibility, the only fault of her life was her having lived upon terms of intimacy with Mrs. Clarke, with that Mrs. Clarke, with whom a prince was living, and with whom we find a *countess* in the closest habits of friendship.—What Miss Taylor foresaw, as the consequence of her evidence, has (*I state it upon unquestionable authority*) actually come to pass.—She and her sister, after much pains and difficulty, had succeeded in establishing a school, at Chelsea, by which they hoped to be able to support themselves. Since she appeared at the bar of the House, she has lost all her scholars, the number being twelve; her goods have been seized for rent and taxes due, and she is now actually in danger of a prison, though the whole of her debts do not exceed *a hundred and fifty pounds*.—It is true, that the rent and taxes and debts were due previous to the inquiry; but, the forcing of her before the House of Commons, caused the loss of her scholars; that is to say, the loss of the only means which she had, or could be supposed to have, of ever paying any of those demands. Viewing her in this state, not only of insolvency, but of *irrecoverable* insolvency, her creditors would naturally fall upon her, and therefore, to the circumstance of her having been compelled to give evidence, and to make a full exposure of all her connections and acquaintance, and to that circumstance *alone*, she owes her ruin, and her present danger of actual imprisonment.—It is not for me to point out, nor is my local situation calculated for the carrying into execution, any precise plan for the relief of this unfortunate and hardly-treated young woman; but, I think it my duty to recommend her case to the public, who, I am sure, will not suffer her to sink into the lowest depths of misery. The payment of her debts is the first thing necessary; because upon that, perhaps, even her life may depend; and that, I think, ought to be followed by the raising of money sufficient to secure her a small annuity. There have been few appeals of this sort made to an English public in vain; and, as far as my recollection serves me, there never was one made with fairer or stronger claims upon public justice.

*Bolton, Thursday, 9 March, 1809.*

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 11.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1809.

[Price 1s.

MR. SPENCER PERCEVAL, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, receives £2,600 a year, in that capacity; for his office in the Treasury, £1,600 a year; as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, £4,525 a year; as Surveyor of Meltings and Clerk of the Irons in the Mint, £126 a year; besides which, he has the grant in reversion, after the death of his brother, Lord Arden, of sinecure offices, or offices executed by deputy, of the clear value, according to their own statement, of £12,562 a year.—These facts, which are stated upon the authority of a Report, laid before the House of Commons, in the month of June last, shew, that this gentleman receives now, 8,851 pounds a year of the public money, and that, if his brother were now to die, he would be in the receipt of £21,413 a year of the public money.

385]

[386

## DUKE OF YORK.

(Continued from page 384.)

THE anxiously looked for discussion of the Evidence, relative to the Charges against the Duke of York, has, by this time (Tuesday) taken place; and, it will naturally be expected of me, that I offer some remarks upon that discussion. This I shall do; but, to go much into detail is impossible, and, indeed, would be useless. The general turn and complexion of the discussion, particularly noticing some characterizing features of it, is all that can be the subject of remark here; but, I think it necessary to state, that the whole of this important Debate, and also the whole of the Evidence and Documents produced by the Inquiry, will in the fullest manner, be inserted in my PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, where the several Speeches will be recorded, in my usual manner, with the most scrupulous impartiality; and, I take this opportunity to notify, that any member, on either side, who may have a wish to have his speech recorded with particular accuracy, shall find his communications punctually and readily attended to.

Before I enter upon any observations upon the debate, as it relates to the great merits of the case, I cannot refrain from noticing a passage, in the speech of Mr. Adam, relating to *my own conduct*. It will be remembered, that, at page 227, in referring to the extraordinary rise of his son in the army, I pointed out the almost inevitable evils that must arise from the making of very young men commanding officers of regiments. In alluding to these remarks, Mr. ADAM, in his speech of the 10th instant, "adverted to the pain, which "some remarks, which had been made, "in a weekly publication, upon his son's "promotion, had occasioned him, and re- "gretted, that he had it not in his power to "shew the House, that the *imputation* found-

"ed upon what had been represented as a "scandalous circumstance, 'that the backs "of a thousand men should be submitted "to a youth, who had not yet attained the "age of twenty one years," so far from "being justified in fact, was most *illiberal* "and *unfair*, and that there was not a bat- "talion in his majesty's service, in which "fewer corporal punishments were inflict- "ed, or in which better military regula- "tions were established."—Now, I need not tell the discerning reader, that, when men find it difficult to rebut what *is* said, they, not unfrequently, are led to attack what *is not* said; and, in the first place, with respect to this complaint of Mr. Adam, after a careful examination of the passage complained of, I do not find, that I have denominated the speedy promotion of Colonel Adam "*a scandalous circumstance*." But, in the next place, I am quite sure, that my words will not, in any hands upon earth, admit of being strained to mean, that the regiment, under the command of that gentleman, was cruelly treated, or that it suffered, in any way, from the circumstance of *his* having the command of it. The words were these: "At twenty-one "years of age *no person in the world* can be "fit for a Lieutenant Colonel. He has the "absolute command of *a thousand men*. "The comfort, the happiness, the morality, "the backs of a thousand men depend upon "his wisdom and integrity. A person to "be intrusted with such a charge, ought "to be sober, considerate, compassionate, "and yet firm to execute justice. Where "are these to be found united with the "passions inseparable from youth? Be- "sides, is it possible, that the other offi- "cers, captains old enough, perhaps, to be "his father, and who have every fair "claim to prior promotion, can cordially "submit to the command, and, occasion- "ally, to the *reproof*, of a boy of twenty-  
N

“ one? What would Mr. Adam say, if he had to plead before a *judge* of twenty-one years of age? Yet, the Lieut.-Colonel of a Regiment (for the Colonel never commands) has powers still greater than those of a judge. He has, in the course of a year, to decide upon the cases of, perhaps, two thousand offences. He has to judge of characters; to weigh the merits of candidates for promotion; his smile is encouragement, and his frown disgrace; it depends upon him, whether the soldier’s life be a pleasure or a curse. Is not all this too much for the age of twenty-one years?” — Now, what *imputation* is there here upon Colonel Adam? Are not all the arguments general? And do they breathe sober common sense; dispassionate reason; or illiberality and unfairness? I am ready to allow, that there is a very great difference in young men; that the days of wisdom begin with some at an age when others ought still to be in leading strings; and, I believe, judging from the character of the father; considering the sort of education, the early habits of sobriety, and of all the moral virtues, which Col. Adam would, in all likelihood, have derived from the example of so good a man and so kind a parent; considering these things, I believe, that Col. Adam may have been as fit for the command of a regiment at the age of twenty-one, as many others at a much more advanced age. But, then, it is the danger of the precedent; and, the small chance that a youth of 21 should be so endowed. Besides, the *passions* of youth who is to quench, or to qualify? That *zeal* for the service, which is so necessary to constitute a good officer, may become mischievous, and greatly mischievous, if unrestrained by wisdom, and this sort of wisdom is not to be obtained without *experience*, which experience must, again, be indebted for its existence to years, and many years, of actual service. I myself, by a combination of rare circumstances, became possessed of great power over the greater part of a regiment, at the age of *nineteen*, I think it was; and, though I always acted for what I deemed the good of the service, I did many things, which I would not now do, if possessed of similar power. Always sober, always in good health, always up long before the sun, with limbs that never felt weary, with a body of iron, and a mind wholly wrapped up in the military service, I made no allowances for the weaknesses, or lukewarmness, of others. That *zeal* which I felt, I was disappointed at not

meeting with in every other breast. Not to run with pleasure at the call of the drum appeared to me as a sort of crime; when I should have considered, that the stimulus which I had, others had not, and that, therefore, to them should have been left other enjoyments. Greater application and zeal than I possessed; a more ardent and sincere desire to do good to the service, I defy Colonel Adam, or any man breathing, to possess; there was nothing that affected the credit of the regiment, which I did not feel more acutely than if it had affected myself. Yet, as I have grown in years; as I have experienced the feelings of husband and father, and as I have had occasion to contemplate the characters, the tempers, the causes of the vices and virtues of men, I have, many times, had to look back with sorrow at many of those acts, which proceeded from the best intentions; therefore, I am qualified to speak upon this matter, and think myself fully justified in the observations that I have made, not believing it to be at all likely, that, out of ten men of twenty one years of age, the nation should afford one more sober, more vigilant, or less likely to have his mind improperly biassed, than I was. — I have thus gone into my own case as an illustration, because I would leave nothing undone to shew, that I was not, in the remarks which appear to have given pain to Mr. Adam, actuated by any motive of “illiberality or, unfairness,” but solely by my conviction of the injurious consequences, which must arise, almost necessarily, from the committing of regiments to the command of such very young men. The law, which, in such matters, contains the accumulated wisdom of ages, denies to persons the possession of their own property, till they be twenty-one years of age; it denies them the liberty of choosing for themselves husbands and wives, until that age, before they have arrived at which, it denominates them *infants*; and, be it observed, that Mr. Adam’s son was a *Major*, and, as such, was, of course, frequently the commanding officer of a regiment, at the age of *twenty*; for, it is notorious, that it seldom happens, that the Lieut. Col. and the Major are both present at the same time. — I shall conclude with declaring my sorrow at having given Mr. Adam pain; and, I think, that the public must be convinced, that I have, as far as my duty would allow me, avoided so doing. He is a gentleman, of whom I have heard much good, of whom, from no party or person, I never heard a word of harm in my life; there

are many circumstances in his progress through public life, which are highly honourable to him, and I myself am under great obligations to his wisdom, his talents, and his disinterestedness: but, if Mr. Adam will, for a moment, put himself in *my place*, I am sure he will say, that I could not have left unnoticed that which, with regard to him, I have noticed, and that my observations could not have been more lenient than they have been, without justly subjecting me to the charge of base partiality.

In entering upon the Debate, the first thing necessary is, to state, as correctly as it can now be done, the several propositions, that have been submitted for the adoption of the House. On the 8th of the month (Wednesday) MR. WARDLE, at the close of a speech, in which he most ably summed up the Evidence upon all the separate Cases, made a motion in the following words : “ That an humble Address be presented to his majesty, humbly stating to his majesty, that information has been communicated to this House, and evidence produced to support it, of various corrupt practices and other abuses having prevailed for some years past, in the disposal of Commissions and Promotions in his majesty’s Land Forces—that his majesty’s faithful commons, according to the duty by which they are bound to his majesty and to their constituents, have carefully examined into the truth of sundry transactions which have been brought before them, in proof of such corrupt practices and abuses; and that it is with the utmost concern and astonishment his majesty’s faithful commons find themselves obliged, most humbly, to inform his majesty, that the result of their diligent inquiries into the facts, by the examination of persons concerned, together with other witnesses, and a variety of documents, has been such as to satisfy his faithful commons, that the existence of such corrupt practices and abuses is substantially true.—That his Majesty’s faithful commons are restrained by motives of personal respect and attachment to his majesty, from entering into a detail of these transactions, being convinced that they could not be stated without exciting the most painful sensations of grief and indignation in the breast of his majesty : That the proceedings of his majesty’s faithful commons upon this important subject have been public, and the evidence brought before them is recorded in the proceedings of parliament ; and

“ that they trust his majesty will give them credit, when they assure his majesty, that in the execution of this painful duty they have proceeded with all due deliberation. That without entering into any other of the many obvious consequences which may be expected to follow, from the belief once generally established, of the prevalence of such abuses in the Military Department, there is one great and essential consideration inseparable from the present subject, which they humbly beg leave, in a more particular manner, to submit to his majesty’s gracious consideration, namely, that if an opinion should prevail amongst his majesty’s Land Forces, that promotion may be obtained by other means than by merit and service—by means at once unjust to the Army and disgraceful to the authority placed over it, the effect of such an opinion must necessarily be, to wound the feelings and abate the zeal of all ranks and descriptions of his majesty’s Army.—That it is the opinion of this House, that the abuses which they have thus most humbly represented to his majesty, could not have prevailed to the extent in which they had been proved to exist, without the knowledge of the Commander in Chief; and that even if, upon any principle of reason or probability, it could be presumed that abuses so various and so long continued could, in fact have prevailed without his knowledge, such a presumption in his favour would not warrant the conclusion that the command of the Army could, with safety, or ought in prudence, to be continued in his hands.—That on these grounds and principles his majesty’s faithful commons most humbly submit their opinion to his majesty’s gracious consideration, that his royal highness the Duke of York ought to be deprived of the Command of the Army.”

MR. PERCEVAL, with the intervention only of MR. BURTON, followed Mr. Wardle, and proposed, in the way of amendment, to leave out the whole of Mr. Wardle’s motion, with the exception of the word “ *That*,” and to substitute the following in its stead :—“ That an Address be presented to his majesty, humbly representing, that in consequence of charges against his royal highness the Duke of York, his faithful commons thought it their indispensible duty to inquire into the same, in the most solemn and public manner ; and after the most diligent and attentive inquiry, his most faithful commons, considering the lively interest his majesty must

"feel in any inquiry respecting the conduct "of his royal highness the Duke of York, "thought it their duty to lay before his "majesty the following Resolutions:—  
 "Resolved, That Charges having been "brought against his royal highness the "Duke of York, imputing to him *personal* "corruption and criminal connivance in the "execution of his office; and this House "having referred the said charges to a "Committee, &c. feels it its duty to pro- "nounce a distinct opinion upon the subject.  
 "—Resolved, That it is the opinion of this "House, after the fullest and most atten- "tive examination of all the evidence ad- "duced, that there is *no ground for charg-*  
*ing his Royal Highness with personal cor-*  
*ruption or connivance* at such practices, "disclosed in the testimony heard at the "bar.—And his majesty's faithful com- "mons think it their duty further to state "to his majesty, that while the House has "seen the *exemplary regularity* and method "in which business is conducted in his "Royal Highness's office, and the *salutary* "regulations introduced by him, some of "which were intended to prevent the "very abuses complained of, and which "have been brought under review, they "cannot but feel the greatest regret and "concern that a connection should have ex- "isted which has thus exposed his Royal High- "ness's character to public CALUMNY, and "that frauds should have been carried on, "with which his Royal Highness's name "has been coupled, of a most disgraceful "and dangerous tendency; but it is, at the "same time, a great consolation to the House "to observe the *deep concern* his Royal "Highness has expressed, that such a "connection should ever have taken "place; and on the expression of that "regret the House is confident that his "Royal Highness will keep in view the "uniformly virtuous and exemplary con- "duct of his majesty, since the commence- "ment of his reign, and which has en- "deared his majesty to all his subjects."

On the 10th (Friday), after Messrs. Bragge and Whitbread and the Attorney General had spoken, Mr. BANKES spoke, and concluded with saying, "that he was decidedly of opinion, that the House would not do its duty, if it did not communicate to the king their opinion, that the Duke of York could *no longer continue an useful servant of the public*. The Address proposed by Mr. PERCEVAL, was, he observed, a mere extract from a *Letter* recently presented to that House, in a very extraordinary, and, in his mind, in a very exceptionable man-

ner. It was the custom to say, that the Address of the House to any Speech from the throne, was generally *the echo of the Speech*; but he never could suppose it possible to be said, that the Address of that House should be *the echo of a letter*. In this case, however, it might be said with justice; and he never could persuade himself to subscribe to such an echo. He hoped the House would manifest an equal unwillingness to do so. If the House could not only endure to receive a letter, which was itself *an infringement on its privileges*, but could submit to send an Address to his Majesty, *in obedience* to that letter, it must be contented to sink in its own estimation and that of the country. Let the proceeding of the House be guided by proper motives, and spring from a pure source, and the country would do justice to its conduct, while it must retain its own good opinion. Differing so decidedly as he did from his right hon. friend, in the conclusions to which his mind had come upon the evidence, he could admit nothing more than that it was barely possible his right hon. friend might be right. But that he was not so, that House would, he hoped, and trusted, for its own credit and character, prove by the decision it pronounced upon this important question."—

Mr. BANKES then proposed a further Amendment, in the following words: "That in- "formation had been laid before the House, "with respect to certain abuses and cor- "ruptions which were alledged to be pre- "valent in the disposal and purchase of "commissions and promotions in his ma- "jesty's land forces. That the House had "accordingly instituted the most diligent "examination into the grounds of such "charges; and that they felt the deepest "concern that the result of that inquiry "was such as to convince them that such "corruptions and abuses had prevailed. That "they had, at the same time, great satis- "faction in being enabled to declare, that "there appeared to them to be no ground "for charging the Commander in Chief "with *personal corruption*; but while they "were glad to do this justice to his Royal "Highness, and to acknowledge the good "consequences that had resulted to the "army from the regulations he had intro- "duced, and the improvements he had "adopted in advancing their discipline "and conduct, still they felt themselves "obliged to express their opinion, that "such abuses cou'd not have prevailed, to "the extent they had done, without exciting "at least the suspicion of the Commander in

"Chief; and that if such abuses had existed without the knowledge of his Royal Highness, that House had great reason to doubt whether the chief command of his majesty's forces could with propriety, or ought with prudence, remain in the hands of the Duke of York. That the House had discovered, with the deepest concern, that a connection had subsisted fraught with injurious consequences to the cause of religion and morals, and of a character the most opposite in its nature to the bright example of morality given, throughout a long reign, by his majesty to his people."

Of these three propositions we will first notice that of Mr. Perceval, which is, as Mr. Banks described it, the mere *echo of a letter*, but with the addition of a declaration, that the Duke of York has been found free from *personal corruption* and from any *connivance* at such corruption.—There is nothing better calculated to bewilder and mislead the public, than an artful *selection of terms*. If the people had put to them this question: "Do you think that it is PROVED, that the Duke of York knew that his mistress took money for using her influence with him, regarding promotions, &c. and that he used his authority to further her views in getting such money?" If this question were put to the people, they would know how to answer at once, without a moment's hesitation; but, by the invention of the term "*personal corruption*," to which vast importance is attached, some people are puzzled; a distinction is erected; a doubt is excited, whether there be not one sort of corruption which is criminal, in the eye of the law, and another *not* criminal in the eye of the law.—But, what is *corruption*? The plain meaning of the word, as applied to persons in authority under the public, is this: the doing of any thing, in his public capacity, for money or money's worth, or for a private consideration of any sort; or the procuring of any thing, from such consideration, unlawfully given, to be done by another person. The minister who should give a place, or a pension, to the son of a rascal (if any such rascal could be supposed to exist, and if any minister could be found to be so base), who, in consideration thereof, should vote for him, would be guilty of corruption, as well as the wretch who should, in that manner, sell his country and his soul; and the corruption would not be the less real because neither of the parties fingered any money, on account of the infamous contract.—Well, then, what is meant

by "*personal corruption*"; why this, that the party must actually *touch the cash*, give or take the money himself; that it must go from him, or *come into his pocket*, literally into his pocket. But, reader, is there any thing solid in this distinction? Is there any thing in it, which reason says ought to have any weight in a decision upon a subject like that before us? If I stand by and see my neighbour robbed, and say nothing at all about the matter, am I not as criminal as the robber? How much *more* criminal must I be, then, if the goods stolen be applied to my use, and if I, by any means that I possess, enable the robber to commit the act, and encourage him to do it, especially if the party robbed be my employer? I do not, observe, state this as a case parallel with that of the Duke of York, upon whose *guilt* or *innocence* I have left, and shall leave, my readers to judge; but, I state it as a general proposition, in the way of illustration of my argument; and, I think, it will leave no doubt at all in the mind of the reader, that corruption may be as base, nay, a great deal *more base*, when the party does not actually *touch the money*, than when he does; and, it will readily occur to every man of reflection, that what is called "*personal corruption*," by which is meant, I suppose, the plain downright direct *giving and taking of bribes*, is, as to its dangerous extent, nothing at all, when compared to corruption of a more round-about and covert nature.—The truth is, that it is this latter sort of corruption, which is really dangerous to a state; and this is the sort of corruption which now is eating away the heart of this country. Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, in his most admirable speech of the 13th instant, speaking of the Case of KENNETT, said, that, from the evidence given in this case, "it appeared that the Duke of York was actuated by a greedy desire of getting money almost by any means, and accordingly undertook to recommend a fraudulent bankrupt to an office under government for the sake of a loan. Here he could not help saying a few words on the subject of corruption. The right hon. gent. (Mr. Perceval) seemed to consider corruption as synonymous with the actual taking of money for improper purposes; and, with this idea in his mind, he said that corruption was not so prevalent in our days as in former times. He thought the golden age was returned; and that, with respect to corruption, our days might be consider-

“ed as a ‘Paradise regained.’ What did the hon. gent. think of the multitudes of offices at the disposal of ministers and their underlings; the colonial places; the situations created by the increase of the various establishments in the country, and the immense amount of the taxes? Of the taxes which had risen to such a height, that men looked up to government in order to get back a part of their own. By the reduction of their incomes, men were first driven to mendicity, and then bribed with their own money. True, these were not times when a member of parliament could take a bribe of £.500 in the lobby, nor when he dined with the Speaker could he expect to find a sum of money under the cover of his plate. We saw little in our times of the open and barefaced corruption of ruder ages. Corruption was now gilded with the name of Office, which was greedily snatched at by him who, as the right hon. gent. had observed, would be ashamed to take the value of ready money into his hand. The Duke of York certainly did not, when acting corruptly, take so many guineas in hand. This was too gross for the times, especially when corruption could be so easily gilded. Corruption had no necessary connection with money—corruption consisted in the corrupt motive, in swaying the mind from truth and justice. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, therefore, might say, that there was less of open bribery in our days than in former times—but he seemed entirely to misconceive the meaning of the term, when he said there was less corruption.”

A bribe in hard cash upon the nail is not half so dangerous as a bribe in the way of office; the former is a transaction which has a speedy end, the latter binds the corrupted party for life, or for a considerable time, in all human probability.—Mrs. Clarke told the House, with her usual frankness, that she was desired to ask some of the persons, whom she patronized, to get members of parliament to vote thus and thus, upon certain occasions; and she mentions one particular instance, wherein the Duke of York told her, that he had informed Mr. LONG of her success in this way, who was much pleased at it. This passed, at first, for one of her sallies; nobody believed, or, at least, nobody, in the House, appeared to believe her; but, by-and-by, out comes a bundle of her sprightly and careless notes, which were in the hands of Sandon, and which the

lawyers had, with their usual judgment, of themselves, of their own seeking, brought forth; and, in these notes, she is found to talk as familiarly of getting votes for Pitt, as one talks of getting a hare or a brace of birds for a friend. In one of these notes, she says to Sandon: “Will you, my good Sir, drop me a line on Monday morning, saying if you have been able to influence any person who is with Pitt, to attend the House on Monday and give his Vote.” The word vote is in italics. She knew what was the thing wanted.—In another note, to the same person, she says: “Do you think it possible to get me a Vote on Monday for Pitt’s motion? It will, if carried, be of some consequence to us hereafter; try all you can.—Now, are we to believe, that Mrs. Clarke would have written thus, if there had been no such thing as “getting votes” going on? Or, are we to believe, that this is a mere specimen, accidentally come to light; forced out, as it were while the Devil was asleep, by the lawyers themselves, to prove to the world, the existence of a generally pervading system of corruption? —I leave these questions to the reader, and beseech him, while yet there is time, to think of the remedy.—The money taken by Mrs. Clarke, and by others under her auspices, for promotions and the like, ought by no means to be considered as applied to her or to their use. The Duke kept her not for her pleasure, or for any purpose of hers; but solely for his pleasure and for his purposes. Therefore, whatever he gave her, he gave from a selfish motive; and, whatever she obtained, no matter in what manner, in consequence of her connection with him, arose from the gratification of his selfish feelings and pleasures. If I were, therefore, to leave out of sight all the evidence relating to his knowledge, that she trafficked in commissions, and that the net proceeds went towards the support of her establishment; if I were to blast, in a lump, all the evidence of Mrs. Clarke, Miss Taylor, the two Letters, and the Note, with all the scores of corroborations verbal and written; still I should say, that it was owing to the existence of the connection; that it was owing to the establishment in Gloucester Place; that it was owing to the adulterous intercourse; that, in short, it was for the gratification of the Duke of York’s lust, and for that purpose solely, that all the infamous acts, which have come to light, were committed.—As to the other parts of Mr. Perceval’s proposition, I will not

stop to notice them. They are, as Mr. Bankes well observed, a mere echo of the Duke's Letter to the House. Any thing much more adulatory was never tendered to any of the Tudors.

MR. WARDLE's proposition does, in my opinion, either not go far enough, or it goes too far. It is true, as lord Folkestone observed, that the Charge upon the Journals does not contain an allegation of personal corruption, or of *corruption* of any sort or degree; but, I think, the Address should have contained an explicit opinion upon *that point*; or, that it should have contained *no opinion at all*. If the person accused had been any other than a near relation of the king, I should have been decidedly for a decision upon that point; but, he being a son of the king, I should have been for merely *laying the evidence before the king*: for, as to "*throwing the odium*" upon the king, by such a step, what do those mean, who talk of that? The "*odium*" of *what* do they talk of? The *odium* of dismissing his son from his office? The *odium* of doing that of *himself*, whatever it may be, which the House of Commons will, or would, advise him to do? The inquiry has taken place; the whole of the evidence is before the public; the people understand the whole matter. Every man in the kingdom understands it as well as it is possible for him to understand it. The king has the same means of judging laid before him. And, why should it be called "*throwing the odium upon him*," to leave the decision to his sole breast? In short, to give any rational interpretation of these words, you must suppose, you must conclude before hand, that the king's decision would be *unjust*, or, at least, that *so it would appear to the nation*; and that, therefore, it is, for the sake of the king, necessary to keep from him the office of deciding. And here again is a dilemma; for, if you talk of "*odium*," as the Nabob's Gazette does, it must fall *somewhere*; and, where will it fall? where can it fall? Indeed, it is nonsense to talk of the *odium* attached to the decision, unless you pre-suppose, that the decision will be *unjust*, to justify which supposition I shall leave as a pleasing task for the trading, the regular trading, Anti-Jacobins, in town and country.—For these reasons, I would have simply moved to submit the evidence to the king, without being at all afraid, that his decision would have exposed him to public reproach. But, at any rate, if I had not done that, I would have brought before the House the direct question as to the *corruption*. There was,

in my opinion, no medium to be adopted, consistent with the ends of justice, or with the character of the House.—If the latter had been rejected, and such a motion as that of Mr. Bankes, which is only one degree removed from that of Mr. Perceval, had been adopted, the original motion would have only shared the fate, which, in all probability, Mr. Wardle's motion will now share; while he would have avoided the possibility of an imputation of having shrunk from the question. I am convinced, that he was actuated solely by the motive of sparing the feelings of the king, and this, indeed, is, by lord Folkestone, stated to have been his motive; but, experience will teach Mr. Wardle, that, however well *forbearance* may be calculated to operate on the mind of the king, and there to produce a reciprocity of feeling, forbearance is not the way to obtain the concurrence of *his servants*, in the House of Commons, who are sure to advance upon you two steps for every one that you recoil. If Mr. Wardle was convinced, that the Duke of York had, knowingly, participated in the profits of the corruption, carried on under his name, he should have made that a distinct question; and, having brought the House to decide that, *yea*, or *nay*, he might, then, very consistently, have supported the next best proposition that should have been made, leaving the country to judge for itself between him and those who opposed him. This, or what I should still have, in this case, preferred, simply laying the evidence before the king, was, in my humble opinion, the path to pursue.

With regard to Mr. Bankes's proposition, much need not be said. It has, though not quite so much of adulation as the proposition of Mr. Perceval, a great deal of the smooth and the sweet in it. It is a mixture of oil and vinegar and molasses; it is a compound certainly, but the pleasant ingredients are not only two to one in number, they predominate also in the quantity of each. There is, indeed, an expression relative to the *dismissal of the Duke*, which, by-the-bye, appears, after all, to be the *thing most dreaded by his friends*, and against which all their efforts have been bent; but, this expression has in it so little of the positive, that, to disregard it could not well be looked upon, by those who use the expression, as a subject of very serious complaint. To me, I will frankly confess, that the *dismissal of the Duke* appears to be an object of no very great importance. In fact, and to speak

out plain, I do not care a straw about the matter, unless the dismission were accompanied with measures, which should *effectually* prevent similar corruptions in future; and, as no such measure appears to be in agitation, I think it of no consequence whatever to the nation, whether the Duke be dismissed or whether he remain.

I cannot, however, agree in the opinion, now expressed by Mr. Banks, and before expressed by several of the ministers, or their friends, "that this Inquiry will do "no good." On the contrary, I think, and I am convinced, that it already *has done* a great deal of good; and that it will continue, with other things, "to work together for good," until the day of perfect purification shall arrive; until the whole of the system of corruption shall be rooted out; until *all* the vermin, who prey and who fatten upon the vitals of the nation, shall have been caught and made to regorge; and until the throne as well as the people shall have been secured from the consequences of their widespread depredations. What! has this inquiry done "no good?" This inquiry, which has *discovered* to the East India Directors such an extensive traffic in *their* offices; and, since the commencement of which by Mr. Wardle, Mr. Perceval has set to work to prosecute the regular traders in offices and *livings*? Good God! not done any *good*?—While, however, this is contended for, on the one hand, in order to lessen, or to deny altogether, the merit of Mr. Wardle, it is as strenuously contended, on the other hand, that the Inquiry will do a wonderful deal of good, as to the future conduct of the Duke of York. The Attorney General, on the 9th of the month, after stating, that he was for a decision that should fall short of making his royal highness retire, or be removed, concluded thus:—"Could any man, after this Inquiry, believe that things would grow worse? Did any man believe that the Duke of York was insensible to the perils and dangers with which he was surrounded, and that he would not *profit by the lesson he had received*? Did any man think he would not be sensible of his acquittal, and of the reproof accompanying it? Did any man believe that he would not be sensible of all these things, and *careful to avoid a similar situation*?"—Well, then, whatever may be *our* opinion upon these points; whatever we may think of the disposition of the Duke, taking into view his letter to the House, and not forgetting the company he has been *proved*

to delight in; whatever may be *our* opinion, *your* opinion is, that he will "*profit from this lesson*"; that he will be sensible of "*the reproof*," which, it appears, that even you would now give him; and, that he will be in future, "*careful to avoid such a situation*." Indeed! But, *to whom*, then, will he be indebted for this profitable lesson? Whom will he have to thank for this affecting reproof? Not you, nor any of those, who are to be numbered amongst his defenders and friends. No, for you, from the first, flattered him with complete acquittal; you scouted the charges against him; and, one of you, in the apparent confident reliance that those charges could not be supported; that the means would be found of hounding them down, asserted, that *infamy* would alight somewhere, upon the *accuser* or the *accused*. No, it is not by you, or any of you, or all of you together, that this great good, as you appear to esteem it, would have been done; but, by Mr. Wardle, and solely by Mr. Wardle; it is he (susposing your proposition to take effect) that will have produced all the good, which you anticipate from it; it is he, and he alone, that will have produced the *lesson* and the *reproof*. Let it be repeated by nobody, then, and particularly by you, that this inquiry has *done no good*, and that the author of it is not entitled to the highest marks of honour that the people can bestow upon him.

Upon the quality of the evidence, or any part of it, I shall not here offer any remark; but, there are two or three *presumptions*, which have been set up by the defenders of the Duke of York, and which I think it proper to point out to the attention of my readers; first observing, what, I dare say, they will all have observed before, that, though it is common enough for a judge to set aside presumptions when opposed to positive testimony, there never was a judge, an English judge, at least, who ventured to set aside positive testimony upon the ground of opposing presumptions.—The first of these presumptions is, that the Duke would not have given into these transactions for the sake of so paltry sum as £2,500, which, it is asserted, was all that Mrs. Clarke gained and brought into the firm at Gloucester Place, by the corruptions in which she had a hand. But, as to the sum, is it not more likely to have been £50,000 than £2,500? Look at her Letters to Sandon; hear the evidence of Sandon and Donovan and Hovenden and Cowrie and others, and you find

the trade of jobs and loans and bills *continually* going on. You hear of many transactions, which have not been at all explained. She forgets scores of people that she has had dealings with. After all that could be done, it remained unproved, that the Duke paid to Gloucester Place more than from 12 to 15 hundred a year. Lord Folkestone, in a speech which he made on the 10th, and which makes good all the expectations of his greatest admirers, has said, that he kept house at the same time, and that he is clearly of opinion, that he, *without any waste or extravagance*, could not have maintained such an establishment for £. 10,000 a year.—But, be the sum what it might, why, in the face of positive testimony, are we to *presume*, that the Duke would not, for a paltry sum, do what was wrong, when we find him, for the paltry sum of £. 400 a year, breaking his promise, to the woman to whom he had written the *two letters*, but a few months before, the existence of which promise Mr. Adam has proved, and the *condition* upon which it was made, has not been proved to have been broken by her? After this proof has been laid before us, *why* are we to presume, that the *smallness* of any sum should be considered as an objection to his using means to obtain or withhold it.—If the Duke had gone as far as the evidence states him to have gone, it is said, *why had he not gone farther?* If he participated in, or connived at, the sale of some commissions, we are asked, *why* he did not do so with respect to more? *Why* did he not raise hundreds of thousands of pounds in this way?—A very good answer might be given; an answer quite sufficient for such a question, that we do not, and, as yet, cannot, know to what extent the traffic may have been carried; for, as MR. WHITBREAD observed, the wonder is, not that *so little*, but that *so much*, has come to light, through that mass of obstructions, which every word of evidence against him, except the evidence of Mrs. Clarke, has had to work its way.—But, is not this the first time, that it ever has been attempted to prove, that a man has not done one thing, because he has not done another, the two being in no wise dependent upon, or connected with one another? Were your servant, upon positive testimony, accused of stealing your spoons, should you expect to hear a presumption urged against the testimony, upon the ground of his not having stolen your mugs and the rest of your plate? Why, if such presumptions were, in the

usual course of justice, admitted to have weight, no man would be hanged for sheep-stealing, till he had got half the flock. Poor sheep! They would, under such law, stand but a bad chance in a hard winter.—The Crown Lawyers have, in this case, as in many others, completely inverted the usual and settled course of arguing. That course is, to presume, that, when a man has *one* fact proved against him, there are *others* behind, which are not proved. Mr. Whitbread very finely observed here, that it was, with common culprits, always “*the first time?*” but, the Crown Lawyers, in place of arguing thus, would have us believe, that, *because* there have been *only four instances*, relating to which positive testimony respecting corruption has been produced, while there has been 15 or 16 thousand promotions in the army, there has been *no corruption at all*. To continue my old illustration of the sheep-stealers, what would a Judge, sitting at Dorchester, say, if a lawyer were to argue, that because the testimony against his client related to only four sheep, stolen from a down where there were fifty thousand feeding every night, it therefore was to be presumed that he had stolen *none at all?* What would the Judge say? Why, he would say nothing; he would smile, and be looking over his notes; and, in his charge to the jury, would certainly think it unnecessary to allude to such an argument.

The second presumption that I shall notice is this: that the Duke, when informed of the charges, expressed his desire that the Inquiry should be *public*; that he would not have done this, and that he would not have before *set Mrs. Clarke at defiance*, unless he had been conscious of innocence.—As to the *mode of inquiry*, the choice was certainly a bad one; it was not favourable to him; but, it gave him much of support, which he could not have had elsewhere; much of legal and oratorical talent; and he had had opportunities of witnessing the result of such inquiries, as in the case of the ill-fated Mr. Paull against Mr. Sheridan. He was acquainted with the person of Mrs. Clarke, but he might be no judge of her *character*, or of how she would act in such a perilous case; a case so perilous, that lord Folkestone tells us, that rumours of *expulsion* were, at one time, afloat with respect to Mr. Wardle himself.—As to the setting of Mrs. Clarke at defiance, he had so long been in the enjoyment of so much power; he must have presumed that nothing was

to be done without the testimony of officers *in the army*; he could not reasonably have supposed, that she would be assisted so ably by the Lawyers; how was he to imagine, that they would *goad* her on to go and hunt out his letters, absolutely goad her till she did it; that Mr. Lowten, his own attorney, would be set to work to force Nicholls to bring a whole package of proofs in support of her, which she had ordered to be burnt; that accident had placed in her careless hands, and what is more, kept there, the letter of the Archbishop of Tuam; and that, at last, as it were for a *grand coup de théâtre*, just before the curtain dropped, his friends, with the manifest expectation of proving a forgery upon her, should *force* from Sandon, should draw from him, as if it had been the last drop of his heart's blood, that NOTE, which, of all things in the whole world, she must have wished to see produced against him, and, at the sight of which, according to the description of Mr. Whittbread, her eyes might well beam with joy?—How was the Duke to have expected all, or any part of this? Nobody could expect it. Mr. Wardle; nay, Mrs. Clarke herself, could not possibly have expected any such thing; and, does not the reader clearly perceive, that, if there had been none of these unexpected discoveries, her evidence, that very evidence which these discoveries have so fully corroborated, would have been set down as a tissue of falsehoods?—How long would her word have stood against Clavering's, if Mr. Lowten had not kindly forced Nicholls to bring the General's own letters, to give the lie direct to what he had said with a view of blasting the credit of her, who had so long and so disinterestedly been his benefactress?—Besides, it was, after Mr. Wardle brought forward his charges, a little too late to attempt to silence Mrs. Clarke. Any overture to her, at this period, for that purpose, ran the manifest risk of failing; and, if it failed, there was the proof of guilt at once. It was too late to recoil, though it was not too late to forbear *gouging* her on to search for proofs of her veracity.—When a man is asked: “Is such a thing *true*, that they say of ‘you,’” he is very apt to say *no*, if he sees that *yes* would be injurious to him; and, when he *has* said *no*, it is not very easy to say *yes* to the same question. It is an old saying, that “one lie makes many.” When once a man gets into falsehood, he generally goes on. It is so difficult to retrace his steps; indeed it is impossible, without

confessing that he has told a falsehood; and this is what few men are found able to bring their minds to. When they make the first denial, they do not see all, nor scarcely any part of the consequences, which are likely to follow; and hence it is, that we invariably see the guilty contribute, in this way, towards their own conviction and condemnation.—There appears, therefore, to be nothing solid in this presumption, founded on the Duke's setting Mrs. Clarke at *defiance*.

The third *presumption* is of a nature still more strange than either of the others. It is this: that, if the Duke had had any knowledge of these corruptions, it is not to be believed, that he would, in so solemn a manner, have denied the fact.—This is, in the tone of the Duke's famous Letter, setting “*the honour of a prince*” in opposition to the evidence taken at the bar, and giving it the preference to all that body of evidence; and, as I observed before, in speaking of that letter, the short way of going to work, if this reasoning be allowed, would have been, to shew Mr. Wardle's charges to the Duke, and to pronounce an acquittal immediately upon his simple declaration that the charges were false. We are asked, with great emphasis: “Can any man believe, that a prince of the illustrious House of Brunswick would ‘have denied these allegations, in so solemn a manner, if he had not been certain of their falsehood?’”—Yes: many men, and I am one of the number. I can believe it, and thoroughly believe it too; and, my reasons for so believing are these. 1. Because the allegations are supported by a great body of evidence as *good* and *much fuller* than what the law requires for the taking away the life of a common malefactor; 2. Because it has been stated by Mr. Adam, that the Duke of York declared to him, that he *never* corresponded with Mrs. Clarke upon military matters, while, by a letter in the Duke's own hand-writing, it is proved, that he did correspond with her on military matters; and 3. Because Mr. Adam has stated, that the Duke of York declared, that he never wrote to Mrs. Clarke the note touching Tonyn's promotion; while, by indubitable testimony, it is proved, that the note extracted from Sandon, was in the Duke's hand-writing, which note was sent to Mrs. Clarke, and which note related to Tonyn's promotion.—For these reasons, if there were no other, I should scout such a presumption as the one above described; which presumption, indeed, if it were, for

one moment, admitted to have any weight, would go to establish a precedent the most dangerous in the world, namely, that the words, and, of course, the *evidence* of persons are to be estimated according to *rank, birth, or wealth*. Upon this subject Sir Francis Burdett asked : “ What had been the Duke of York’s conduct with regard to Mrs. Clarke ? He separated from her, not certainly for having taken money for commissions. His excessive love for her was the only circumstance that could at all have extenuated his offence, and yet it appeared that she was shaken off like an old shoe, and threatened with infamy. This she had asserted, and her testimony stood unrebutted, although the means existed by calling the messenger. She begged for money to pay her debts, and on condition of receiving this she had offered to give up the claim to her annuity ; but even this was refused. Where was “ the honour of a Prince ” then ? This was, surely, no great settlement, considering the terms on which she had lived with the Duke of York, and all the circumstances. He said “ you have no bond, no legal demand,” and there was “ the honour of a Prince.” If this was honour, it was a sort of honour which scarcely included the ingredients of honesty and fair dealing, and which could not weigh a feather in opposition to the evidence before the House.”—Mr. Whitbread, upon the same subject, was still more impressive ; and, indeed, the whole of his speech was one of the best that ever was heard from any man. “ Why,” said he, “ has the Duke of York written such a letter to the House ? I speak not now of its trenching upon our privileges ; but, why did he reduce us to the melancholy situation of believing the evidence we have heard, even against “ the honour of a prince ? ” The honour of a prince ! Alas ! we must all come to that fatal period, when death, which knows no distinction, will class the prince with the peasant ; and yet, if we turn our eyes to that awful spectacle, shall we not find the wretch, with a rope about his neck, protesting that innocence which he knows he is not possessed of ? *Protestations*, then, “ I never will heed : in this case I hear of them with horror.”—Of that Letter, that intolerable Letter, enough will be to be said hereafter ; but, in what it relates to the subject before us, it must be asked, what the Duke means by the *distinction*, which his words clearly convey. Does

he mean that the honour of a prince is of superior quality to that of a man in private life, and entitled to the same degree of precedence, as he himself would be in a public procession ? If he would impress us with an idea, that his honour is of quality superior to that of an earl, or a gentleman, we must ask him where it was, what was its influence, when his declarations were made to Mr. Adam, relative to the not corresponding upon military matters, and to the writing of the note about Tonyn ; that note, which was thought to be destroyed, and which, good God ! Mr. Perceval, in his speech, presumed to be a forgery by Mrs. Clarke ; a crime, affecting the life of the woman, to whom the Duke had vowed everlasting love ?

I have noticed these presumptions a little more fully (though not so well, perhaps) than I find them noticed in the reports of the speeches, not because there was any danger of their producing effect upon the public mind ; but because they are all, absolutely *all* that has, by the combined ingenuity of so many ingenious men, been found out to weigh against the evidence taken at the bar. Upon that evidence the public is well able to judge ; and I have now laid before my readers all that I can discover, which has, taking it as a whole, been opposed to it. As to the nature of the evidence, and the characters and credibility of the witnesses, the public is in possession of all the means of judging ; and, when they have attended to the *presumptions*, above noticed, they see all, aye all, that has been opposed to the great mass of evidence taken at the bar.

To those, who have read the speeches of Lord Folkestone and Sir Francis Burdett, not a word need be said upon the treatment which Mr. Wardle and his witnesses have received, nor upon the general and uniform conduct, through the whole of this affair, of the *king’s servants* in the House of Commons. Indeed, no man of common observation could stand in need of the remarks made, as to these matters, in those speeches ; and, if there be any part of the conduct of Mr. Wardle, at which I feel regret, it is his having stated, that he had received indulgence and assistance at the hands of the ministers and their friends ; in which statement, if meant ironically, the irony is imperceptible to common discernment ; and, if not so, does not well square with that character of *sincerity* and *plain dealing*, which has distinguished Mr. Wardle from the outset, which, at once, gained him the hearts of

the country, and which, in fact, it was that carried him safely through all the perils, with which he was encompassed. Complimenting, I never knew succeed in gaining over, or in softening, any ministry; while I never knew it fail to weaken more or less, the confidence of the people. It is so much in the style, in the common cant, of professed feed advocates, that it never fails to excite some degree of suspicion as to the sincerity of those who use it. There is, honest nature tells every living soul, a fit antipathy of *right* to *wrong*; and, if we would be not only right, but thought to be so in sincerity and in earnestness, we must take care that the fashion of the times does not lead us into that sort of refinement, which must excite a doubt as to the existence of such antipathy. There is, on this account, a great draw-back from the excellence of Mr. Whitbread's speech, who sets out with almost fulsome compliments on that of Mr. Perceval, which he praises for qualities, not only which, it is evident, he perceives it did not possess, but of which he is prepared to shew, and of which he actually does shew, that it is completely destitute. This may, for aught I know, be refinement; it may suit the manners of the times; but, I shall, I hope, always continue to look upon such refinement as but a very bad exchange for simplicity and sincerity; and I am sure, that such refinement, though it may be considered ornamental in an orator, and may tend to smooth his intercourse in life, will never be compatible with earnest and efficient efforts to rescue the nation from the effects of corruption, which is a monster not to be dealt with courteously, not to be even smiled upon without the danger of contamination, or, at least, of suspicion of such contamination. There is no occasion for brutal manners, or rough language; and Mr. Wardle has gained much by his mildness and good-nature; but, these may exist in the highest possible degree, without any of that over-strained civility, that refinement, which is at war with sincerity, and, indeed, which is at war with *truth*. It is this very refinement, this fashionable refinement, this prevalent desire to keep smooth the intercourse in high life; it is this, and this alone, that has prevented these and similar corruptions from being blazoned forth long ago. There have not been wanting men, and men enough, of talents more than sufficient, and of integrity too, who have seen these things, and who have felt indignant at their existence; but, they

have wanted courage, that sort of courage which is much more rare than the courage necessary to mount a breach bristled with bayonets, namely, the courage to overcome solicitations, to encounter the frowns of all the fashionable host, and to see the world of your acquaintance turn their backs upon you. This sort of courage Mr. Wardle has been found to possess, and I trust, that nothing upon earth will induce him to deviate from the plain path, in which he set out.

Much has been said, in the debate, about the "*clamour out of doors*," and about the people having been misled by "*garbled statements*."—When the popular opinion is *for* any measure adopted by the government; when it is *in approbation* of the conduct of the king's ministers, then it is termed the "*voice of the people*," or the "*sense of the nation*"; but, when it runs in *opposition* to their wishes, then it is "*popular clamour*." It could not fail to be observed, in the debate, in answer to this charge against the people, that those who now urge it, advised the king "*to appeal to the sense of his people*," when they came into power, under the cry of *no-popery*. Then the people had *sense*, it seems, but now their wish is mere *clamour*, though it is pretty clear, I think, that they understand this subject *full as well* as they did that, to say the least of it. Why is this not called an "*appeal to the sense of the people*?" One of the advantages, which the Duke's friends expected, and said they expected, from an examination at the bar, was *publicity*. What did they mean by *publicity*, if it was not the communication of the evidence to the people? and what *end* was that to answer, unless it was that the people should *express their opinions* upon the case? Their opinions, it would seem, from this charge of "*clamour*," are pretty distinctly expressed *against* the Duke of York; but, whose fault is that? They might have been expressed as loudly in his *favour*; and yet, in that case, I very much doubt, whether we should have heard a word about "*popular clamour*."

—As to *garbled statements*, it is, as Lord Folkestone observed, quite wonderful to see the fulness and the accuracy, with which the evidence has, from day to day, been given in the news-papers. One must actually see it to believe the thing possible; to believe it to be within the compass of human ability; nor is the fact a little creditable to the literary talents of the country. Gentlemen of the House of

Commons now complain of their fatigue of body and mind. This complaint is reasonable enough; but if their fatigue is great, their fatigue, who sit at their ease; who can walk out and return at their pleasure, and who can be absent for half the night or more; what must be the fatigue of the gentlemen, who report the proceedings; who are sometimes squeezed, from eight o'clock in the morning to three in the afternoon, into a close and hot passage, there compelled to stand all the while; who thence remove into a not less crowded gallery; who have no convenience for writing other than a book in their hand and an ink bottle at their breast; who are obliged to attend to all that passes, the fingers moving, while the ear is constantly upon the stretch to catch the often inarticulate sounds that proceed from below, and amidst a buzz of whispering and noises of various sorts; and who have had to follow this, night after night, with little cessation, for six weeks past: what, I ask, must be the fatigue of these gentlemen, and how great ought our admiration to be at what they do actually perform?—But, as was observed, the garbling, if there has been any, has been reciprocal, at worst; and, I am sure, that every candid man will say, that, of all the London Daily papers, the only one guilty of flagrant and base partiality; nay, the only one which has pronounced judgment, has been the Morning Post, which has pronounced the *acquittal* of the Duke of York, and which has loaded all the witnesses against him with every term of reproach contained in our language.—I hope the reader will bear this in mind. No other paper; no other editor; no other public writer, that I know of, or that I have heard of, has attempted to anticipate the decision of the House of Commons; but, the editor of this paper has told them how they ought to decide; and, not only that, but has told them, that, if they do not *acquit* the Duke, and consider all the evidence against him as lies, *they will not do their duty*.—Yet, do the friends of the Duke, and they alone, complain of partial and garbled statements!—No: never were the people, upon the whole, so amply and so faithfully informed, upon any subject, within my remembrance. To impose upon them would, indeed, have been very difficult; but, except in the case of the Morning Post, I have not seen an attempt so to do. There is, indeed, extreme anxiety prevailing; but, as Sir Francis Burdett observed in the closing part of his

speech, the people ask for, and wish for nothing but *justice*. “Many,” he said, “had been the warnings which the House had received against *popular influence*. It might be unparliamentary to say, that the House could be swayed by any undue influence—but of all influence that could possibly operate, that of the people he believed was the last to be feared. There were indeed, other kinds of influence, which would weigh more with ordinary men, although they could not be supposed to have any effect on the minds of Members of Parliament. But the anxiety in the public mind was, that the decision should be just. The people of England had always been remarkable for their love of justice, and justice alone was what they required. If their minds were divested of the opinion of the prevalence of undue influence in that House, the decision would readily be received as just, whether for or against the Duke of York. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Gentlemen who held places under him would walk out, and leave the rest to decide, whatever might be the result the people would be satisfied.”

—This virtue, this love of justice, is so deeply rooted in the hearts of Englishmen, that nothing can extirpate it. Their enemy, be he who he may, the moment he is arraigned, loses, in their eyes, the character of enemy. If the whole nation could be impanelled, and had the Devil upon trial, they would, if left to themselves, use him fairly.

The plain truth is, that all this querulousness, on the part of the Duke of York's defenders, arises, not from any thorough persuasion, that there is really what might properly be called a “popular clamour” against him; that the people have been misled by garbled statements; but, from a feeling of uneasiness and impatience to see, that the people, upon a clear understanding of the whole of the case, are steadily fixed in opposition to their views; and that, at last, they have been roused, beyond the power of all the soporifics in the world, to a sense of the existence of a system of corruption more extensive than they could, with reason, have supposed to exist.—Yet, I think, it is as clear as the noon-day sun, that, if this nation is not to be conquered; if this government is not to be overthrown; if England is not to share the fate of Holland and Italy, as I trust she is not, she will owe her salvation to those, who have set about, and shall set about, and shall effect, the rooting out,

while there is yet time, those corruptions, and all those abominations, which, more than the armies of Napoleon, have contributed towards the fall of the old governments upon the continent of Europe. Mr. Coke of Norfolk, in his speech of the 14th, which, to obviate the charge of *garbling*, I take from the Morning Post news-paper, is reported to have said, “that, “though the original Address may not be “carried, yet in conscience he would say, “from the evidence, that there was corruption in the extreme, personally attached to “the Duke of York. Circumstantial evidence he built upon, and this he felt to be much stronger than positive evidence, “at least it had carried more men to the gallows. Had any doubt remained on his mind in the matter, the speech of his hon. friend Mr. Whitbread would have removed it all. (*Order! order!*)—“He (Mr. Coke) was determined to oppose corruption, whatever form it may assume; and its defence he would leave to those who were likely to thrive by it.—(*Order! Order!*)—If the country were to be saved, it could only be by opposing such corruption. When he looked to the situation of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, he would no longer pay any degree of attention to what they said on the subject.—(*Loud cries of order! order!*)—The hon. gent. concluded by returning his thanks to the hon. mover, Colonel Wardle.”—Yes, if this country is to be saved, it must be as Mr. Coke says, by opposing corruption. The people must be brought to a conviction, that they are fairly dealt by; that the means collected from their earnings are honestly and judiciously, or, at least, honestly disposed of; and, surely, this conviction they ought to have, if it be possible to give it them, which it is, by letting them see that the parliament and the servants of the king are ready to co-operate cordially in bringing to light, and in punishing, all corrupt practices, let the guilty parties be who they may.—MR. PLOMER (the Solicitor General) and some others, spoke of the pain, which a sentence against the Duke, must give to him and to the king. Those gentlemen are not the only persons that feel this. The people in general feel it as they ought, and every one is anxiously desirous to spare the feelings of the king. But, it is here a question of *justice*, and that is to be done at all events. There is nothing vindictive in the feeling of the public. All they ask is, security for themselves; and this they are convinced they can-

not have without justice being now done.—The “conspiracy” has again been mentioned, but, I observe with pleasure, in a feebler tone of voice; and jacobinism, poor jacobinism, has fallen into such disrepute as no longer to be deemed worthy of assisting to swell out a period. Nobody will believe Mr. Coke to be a jacobin and leveller, and yet, we see, that he has a very decided opinion upon the conduct of the Duke of York. His short speech is worth many a long one; worth whole volumes of some speeches, and will tell for more throughout the kingdom. These out-cries about a *conspiracy* and *jacobinism* did, at the first, indicate no confidence of the goodness of the cause of those who made use of them. Nor did they indicate much of that which the world calls wisdom. From that moment to the close of the Inquiry, they gave us proofs of no wisdom. Wise men would not have goaded Mrs. Clarke; wise men would not have done many other things, which were done, and every one, aye, to the very last, operated against themselves. But, in fact, there is nothing that is a match for Truth, if she has only a small portion of fair play.—In my next I shall, I doubt not, be able to record the result of this long and interesting inquiry and discussion. The public have, as I wished, fixed their attention wholly and exclusively upon it; they have thought and justly thought, that, until this question was decided, it was time wasted for them to attend to any other matters of a public nature; that, until this was decided, they knew not how to feel, what to wish for, or what to fear. The campaigns of the continent; the views of courts! what were they, what could they be, to us, until this great question at home, at our very doors, was settled? This is the light, in which the people have viewed the matter; they have, at last, fixed their eyes upon that which is to them the only interesting object; having so done, there is little fear of their being deceived in future; and, let all those who have lived upon corruption, who have thriven only because the people were blind, *take warning in time.*

*Botley, Thursday, 16 March, 1809.*

---

SUBSCRIPTION  
FOR  
**MISS TAYLOR.**

*Botley, March 12, 1809.*

In consequence of the observations, made in the last number of my Register, respecting the distressed situation of Miss

TAYLOR, I have this day received letters, which have determined me to endeavour to set on foot the Subscription there recommended.

The Statement of her Case is this: She and her Sister (not having parents able to support them) set about, and, after great difficulty, had succeeded in establishing a School, at Chelsea, by which they hoped to be able to support themselves; that (as Mr. WARDLE has declared in the House of Commons), when he told her that he must have her Evidence, she said, that "if she told the truth, she knew it would be to the utter ruin of herself and her dearest connections, and that she hoped he would not force her forwards;" that, since she appeared at the bar of the House, where suspicions were raised with respect to her character, she has lost all her Scholars, the number being twelve; that her goods have been seized for rent and taxes due, and that she is now actually in danger of a prison, her debts amounting to about a hundred and fifty pounds beyond the utmost extent of her means.

Now, though it is true, that the rent and taxes and debts were due previous to the Inquiry, to give evidence in which she was forced; though it is evident, that she must have been struggling with great difficulties before; still it is not less evident, that it is that circumstance which has, at once, disabled her from longer maintaining the struggle; for, in taking from her her scholars, it took from her the possibility of paying her Debts, it rendered her insolvency irretrievable, and, of course, brought all her creditors upon her.—Thus has this young woman, in whom, especially if we consider the circumstance of her family connections, it was no weak effort of virtue to set about and effect an establishment whereby to gain an honest livelihood, been completely ruined; reduced to misery almost as great as can be conceived, not by any fault of her own, not even with the assistance of any foible, but merely by having been forced to appear as a Witness in a situation, which exposed all her connections and acquaintance.

Of the particulars relating to her pecuniary affairs I am informed under her own hand, through a gentleman whom I requested to make the inquiry of her; but, in any other respect I know of her no more than what is known by the public in general; and, if that public think, as I do, that her evidence, from first to last, was clear, consistent, and unshaken; that, after every effort had been made to find out grounds

of imputation against her character, not the smallest grounds were discovered; and that the only fault of her life imputed to her, by those even whose object it was to throw discredit upon her, was, her having lived upon terms of intimacy with Mrs. Clarke, with that Mrs. Clarke, in whose company she met with a Prince of the Blood, and with which Mrs. Clarke we find a Baroness, a General, and a Dr. of Divinity in the closest habits of intercourse and professed friendship, and of which Mrs. Clarke she was a relation: if this be the opinion of the public, I am persuaded there will be persons enough ready to lend a hand in lifting her from that ruin, which without such assistance, is inevitable.—I propose, if I should succeed in this Appeal to the compassion, and I must say, the justice, of the public, first to call her creditors together, and discharge her debts; then, with whatever remains, to purchase her something that she may be sure to enjoy for her life, jointly, I think, with her sister; because it is the ruined female, and not the witness, that we have it in contemplation to relieve, and to sustain.

Subscriptions will be received at the Banking House of MESSRS. BROWN, COBB, and Co. Lombard Street; by my Publisher, MR. RICHARD BAGSHAW, 10 Brydges Street, Covent Garden; and by MR. JOHN BUDD, Bookseller, 100 Pall Mall, who have Books opened for the purpose, and who will, to any gentlemen in the country, that may choose to subscribe, send receipts for the sums they receive. Each Subscriber will be so good as to leave his address, it being my intention to transmit to each, on the 1st of May, when I purpose to close the Subscription, an Account of what has been received, and also of the manner in which it has been expended.

WM. COBBETT.

\* \* \* I have to acknowledge the goodness of several Gentlemen, who have stepped forward to assist in this undertaking, especially MR. TIMOTHY BROWN, who has kindly offered to receive Subscriptions at his Banking-house, and into which I have directed Messrs. Bagshaw and Budd to pay all that they may receive on this account.

#### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Palafox's Proclamation to the Arragonese.*—(Concluded from p. 256.)

2. That such towns as do not contribute all in their power to the relief of our present ne-

cessities, shall be treated as enemies to our king whose sovereign rights we defend, and their inhabitants of every rank shall be punished as traitors.—3. That every individual of the army of reserve, and the recruits of Arragon, already enrolled and regimented, who shall not join his corps, within the space of six days thereof, shall be treated as a deserter in time of war, and as such shall suffer the pains of law.—4. That the alcaldes shall scrupulously examine the soldiers in their respective wards, who may not have so joined, and make a return of their names and the corps they belong to; and that the justices of the kingdom of Arragon do, under the responsibility of person and property, transmit an exact list of all the individuals of their jurisdiction, who have served in the army, distinguishing the cavalry from the infantry, and remarking their state of health and personal vigour.—5. That all who profess want of confidence in the chiefs of the people or the army, who make pasquinades, excite riots or disturbances, shall be immediately apprehended, and carried before the newly-appointed judge of the police, Don Santiago Penicela, who will pass judgment according to the times and critical circumstances in which the country is placed, and suitable to their crimes; imposing the punishment of death he shall consult me.—6. That all the measures adopted shall be obeyed with religious respect, since they are all directed to the good of the country, which will recompence in more happy times the sacrifices we make, and which are so pleasing to God and the celestial protectress who guards us.—7. That all the houses shall be well supplied with cisterns and vessels of water, in order to be ready to assist in extinguishing any fire which may occur: and that the Alcaldes de Barrio shall in particular superintend this important preparation.—8. That the entrance and departure of persons by the gates shall be watched with the greatest care, recollecting that the enemy even assume our dress, and resort to every artifice, because they do not trust entirely to their force, though greatly superior in numbers.—9. That precisely three days shall be allowed for the departure of all the women, old men arrived at sixty, and all the boys not able to carry cartridges, with moderate equipages, for whose convenience orders have been is-

sued to all the towns and villages, to receive them with kindness, to supply their wants.—10. That all Frenchmen, who may happen to be within the city, shall be presented to the judge of the police, in order to be removed without the walls. All the women and children of the same nation shall be removed with their husbands and fathers; as also all the prisoners and deserters from the enemy's army, to places appointed for their reception.—11. To prevent those persons, whose virtue is respected by every catholic from being exposed to insult, I permit the nuns to proceed to occupy other convents, without the limits of the city and suburbs, where they may have an opportunity of devoting themselves, without interruption, to their holy exercise.

*Twenty-Eighth Bulletin, of the French Army in Spain, (concluded from page 352.)*

— — — — — The English Government is like the liar in the play, who has told the same untruth so often, that at last he believes it himself.—Lugo was pillaged and sacked by the enemy. We cannot impute these disasters to the English general: it is the usual and inevitable effect of forced marches and precipitate retreat. The inhabitants of the kingdoms of Leon and Galicia hold the English in horror. Under this head, the events that have taken place are equivalent to a great victory.—Zamora, whose inhabitants had been animated by the presence of the English, shut their gates against general Maupetit: general Dorneau proceeded against it with four battalions; he scaled the city, took it, and put the most guilty to the sword. Galicia is the province of Spain which manifests the best disposition, it receives the French as deliverers, who have relieved them at once from foreigners and from anarchy.—The bishop of Lugo, and the clergy of the whole province, manifest the wisest sentiments.—Valladolid has taken the oath to king Joseph. Six men, the leaders of revolt and massacre of the French, have been condemned to death. Five have been executed. The clergy asked pardon for the sixth, who is a father of four children. His Majesty commuted his sentence, and said, he wished thereby to testify his satisfaction of the good conduct of the secular clergy of Valladolid on several important occasions.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 12.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 25, 1809.

[Price 1s.

"That all who profess *want of confidence* in the Chiefs of the people, or of the army, who make *pasquinades*, excite riots or disturbances, shall be immediately apprehended, and carried before the newly-appointed judge of the police, Don Santiago Penicela, who will pass judgment according to the times and critical circumstances of the country. Imposing the punishment of *death* he shall consult me."—PALAFOX's Proclamation to the Arragonese.—*Nota Bene*: Palafox has been since beaten, and the Arragonese have, the French say, received them with open arms.

[417] [418]

## DUKE OF YORK.

(Continued from page 412.)

BEFORE I proceed with my commentary upon the published reports of the proceedings in the House of Commons, I cannot help directing the attention of the reader to the passage, which I have taken for a motto. They will find in it the *practice* of what the venal herd of writers amongst us, are so strenuously inculcating in principle; and, they will not fail to recollect, that, every where, the French have been opposed by similar practices. Is it any wonder, then, that the French should have succeeded? If a *want of confidence* in the chiefs of the people, or of the army, was to be a crime; if to *make pasquinades*, that is to say, to *ridicule those chiefs*, was to be punished with death, perhaps; if such were the powers of Don Santiago Penicela, and Don Palafox, the poor people had quite enough to do to keep themselves out of *their* clutches. It was useless, entirely useless, to endeavour to *scare* them with descriptions of the character and conduct of the French; for, how were they to form an idea of any thing worse than what they had? King Joseph might be very ingenious in his inventions for keeping the people down; but, was it possible, that the people could conceive, that they could possibly fall lower than that state, in which to profess *want of confidence* in their chiefs was to subject them to a fair chance of the halter? And *why*; for *what reason*, should Palafox be afraid of the effect of *pasquinades*? It has always an ugly look, when men, in power, set that power to work to stifle remarks upon their characters and conduct. The Supreme Central Junta, that is to say, the general government of Spain, began their operations by a proclamation, or decree, against "the 'licentiousness of the press';" and, we see, that, notwithstanding this, Joseph

Napoleon is on the throne of Spain. He may establish, all over the country, judges, armed with powers similar to those of Don Penicela; but, it is not easy to conceive, that he will be able to surpass these powers. —This is not the way to fight the French; this is not the way to preserve countries from being conquered by Napoleon; this is not the way to engage *the people* in a hearty co-operation with the government; and, those, I think, must be blind indeed, who do not now see, that, without such co-operation, no government will be able to stand against the arms of a powerful invading enemy. There is no one so blind; every one sees this; but, there are, and will be, some, who will affect not to see it, and which affectation they will persevere in to the very last.—"Hate the French, or we will punish you." "Oh, O! say you so," answer the people in their minds, "Why, then, what have we to fear from the French more than from you?" Thus it has been all over the continent. Men do not like to be threatened with the dark cell, or the halter; and they will, because it is in nature that they should, not only run the risk of sacrifices, but will actually make great sacrifices, in order to obtain vengeance upon those, who keep such threats suspended over their heads.

In returning, now, to the discussion, relative to the Duke of York, I will first endeavour to give a clear statement of what has been *done* by the House of Commons, whose acts, in this respect, owing to the length of the debates, and the many motions that have been made, have been rendered confused.—First, Mr. Wardle proposed an Address to the king (see it, page 389), which address expressed the opinion of the House, THAT THE DUKE KNEW OF THE ABUSES, WHICH HAD BEEN PROVED TO HAVE EXISTED, AND THAT HE OUGHT TO BE DEPRIVED OF THE COMMAND. Q

OF THE ARMY; for which motion, when it came to be put, there were 125, and against it 363. This, though not *directly* and *explicily*, contained the charge of corruption, and for this one hundred and twenty-five members *voted*, not including Sir Francis Burdett, who was so ill as to be compelled to leave the House previous to the division. The names of the members, who voted for this motion, I here record, in the hope, that my work will hand them down to the knowledge of their and our children.

Adams, Charles  
Althorpe, Viscount  
Antonie, W. Lee  
Astell, Wm.  
Aubrey, Sir John, Bt.  
Bagenall, Walter  
Baillie, Evan  
Baring, Thomas  
Baring, Alexander  
Bastard, John Pollexfen  
Bewicke, Calverley  
Biddulph, Rt. Middleton  
Bradshaw, Hon. Aug. C.  
Brand, Hon. Thomas  
Brogden, James  
Brown, Anthony  
Byng, George  
Calcraft, John  
Coke, Thomas William  
Colborne, N. White Ridley  
Combe, Harvey Christian  
Cooke, Bryan  
Craig, J.  
Creevey, Thomas  
Curwen, John Christian  
Cuthbert, Jas. Ramsey  
Daly, Rt. Hon. Den. Bowes  
Dickenson, William  
Fellows, Hon. Newton  
Ferguson, R. C.  
Fitzgerald, Rt. Hon. M.  
Foley, Hon. Andrew  
Foley, Thomas  
Folkestone, Visc. (Teller)  
Goddard, Thomas  
Gordon, William  
Grenfell, Pascoe  
Halsey, Joseph  
Hamilton, Lord Archibald  
Hibbert, George  
Honeywood, William  
Horner, Francis  
Horrocks, Samuel  
Howard, Hon. William  
Howard, Henry  
Howorth, Humphrey  
Hughes, William Lewis  
Hume, William Hoare  
Hurst, Robert  
Ilsey, William  
Hutchinson, Hon. Chr. II.  
Jackson, J.  
Jacob, William  
Kemp, Thomas  
Kensington, Lord  
King, Sir J. Dashwood  
Knapp, George  
Lanabton, Ralph John

Langton, William Gore  
Latouche, John  
Latouche, Robert  
Lefevre, Charles Shaw  
Lester, Garland  
Lloyd, James M.  
Lloyd, Sir Edward Pryce  
Longuan, George  
Lyttleton, Hon. W. H.  
Madocks, Wm. Alex.  
Mahon, Viscount  
Markham, John  
Martin, Henry  
Maule, Hon. William  
Maxwell, William  
Milbanke, Sir Ralph  
Mildmay, Sir Henry  
Milner, Sir Wm. Mord.  
Moore, Peter  
Morris, Robert  
Moseley, Sir Oswald  
Mostyn, Sir Thomas  
Neville, Hon. R.  
Noel, Gerard Noel  
Ord, William  
Ossulston, Lord  
Parnell, Henry  
Peirce, Henry  
Pelham, Hon. C. Anderson  
Pochin, Charles  
Porcher, Josiah Dupre  
Portman, E. B.  
Prittie, Hon. F. A.  
Pynn, Francis  
Ridley, Sir Matth. White  
Romilly, Sir Samuel  
Scudamore, Rich. Philip  
Sebright, Sir John S.  
Sharp, Richard  
Shelley, Henry  
Shelley, Timothy  
Shipley, William  
Smith, Samuel  
Smith, John  
Smith, George  
Staniforth, John  
Stanley, Lord  
Symonds, Thos. Powell  
Talbot, R. Wogan  
Taylor, Charles William  
Taylor, William  
Thomas, George White  
Thompson, Thomas  
Tighe, William  
Townshend, Lord John  
Tracey, C. H.  
Turner, J. F.  
Vaughan, Hon. John

Walsh, Benjamin  
Wardle, Gwillim Lloyd  
(Teller)  
Western, Charles Callis  
Wharton, John  
Whitbread, Samuel

Whitmore, Thomas  
Wilkins, Walter  
Williams, Owen  
Wilmington, Sir T. E.  
Wynn, Sir Wat. Williams  
Wynn, Ch. Wat. Williams

—In this List; this list, which is always to be kept in view by the country, there is one Military Officer, GENERAL FERGUSON, and one Naval Officer, ADMIRAL MARKHAM. SIR SAMUEL ROMILLY, and Mr. C. W. WYNNE, are the only lawyers, that I know of, in the list.—Mr. Wynde's conduct has been very good indeed; and Sir Samuel Romilly has confirmed all the good opinion which all men entertained of him.

The next division, not the next in point of order, but in point of importance, was that upon the motion of Mr. BANKES, for which, at full length, see page 392 of this volume. Upon this motion, which expressed, that the Duke *must have had a suspicion, at least, of the existence of the corrupt practices, and a doubt, whether the chief command of the army could with propriety, or ought with prudence to remain in his hands*; upon this motion, there were 199 *for*, and 294 *against*; so that, here were 199 members of the House, who voted, that the Duke *must have had a suspicion, at least, of the corruptions, and that it was neither proper nor prudent to leave the chief command of the army in his hands*.

After this, the House adjourned until Friday, the 17th of March, when a motion by Mr. PERCEVAL, in the form of Resolution, was decided upon.—Mr. Perceval, as will be seen by a reference to page 390, proposed certain *resolutions*, to be followed by an *address*, which address will there be seen.—On the day to which we are now come, he new-moulded his resolutions, making one out of the two, and stating in that one, “That it was the opinion of the House, that there was no ground to charge his royal highness with personal corruption, or with any connivance at the corrupt and infamous practices disclosed in the evidence.” There was an Amendment to this, proposed by Sir THOMAS TURTON, which being negatived, a division took place upon Mr. Perceval’s Resolution, when there appeared *ayes*, 278, and *noes*, 196, leaving the king’s servants a majority of only 82. So that, to the proposition, that the Duke had NOT been guilty of personal corruption, or connivance at such corruption; to this proposition, to this *acquittal* of the direct criminal part of the charge, there are 196 members to say NO.

The next division to be recorded is that, which took place upon the motion of Mr. BRAGGE; but, before we come to that, it will be better to stop, and look a little at the *discussion*, which took place on the 17th of the month.—It was again, in this debate, urged, that the Duke, after the intended reproof, would *reform*; and, what sort of reproof Mr. Perceval had in view, the reader will have seen. As there is a most monstrous deal of *cant* in this, I wish to notice it somewhat particularly.—This idea of a hope of reformation does, indeed, harmonize perfectly with all the talk about the Duke's being *imposed upon*; about his having fallen into the *snares* of an artful woman; about his being *infatuated* by her; and about his being blinded by the *excess* of his *passion* for her. The passion was not, however, so excessive, as to prevent him from casting her off, aye, and that, too, without *paying* her the *preised pension*, without redeeming her body from imminent danger of a jail, in about seven months after he had vowed everlasting love to her; nor was it so excessive as to prevent Taylor from carrying a message to her (said to be from the Duke) threatening her with the *pillory* or the *Bastile*. But, how stand the facts, as to the probability of his being *imposed upon* by this artful woman? To read these speeches, expressing confident hopes of amendment; to read the whining, sniveling expression of sorrow for the existence of the connection, which had led to these disclosures; which had led to this exposure; which had led to this what Mr. Perceval, in his Address, calls *calumny* on the Duke; to read these, who, that was unacquainted with the real state of the case, would not suppose Mrs. Clarke to be another Millwood, and the Duke another Barnwell? Who would not suppose him to be a youth of 17 or 18 years of age? An infant at law? A mere chicken? Who would suppose him to be nearly forty six years of age, and to have been a *married man* for about twenty years? The Duke is three years older than I am; and he is two years older than a brother of mine, who has been a *grandfather* these two or three years past; while Mrs. Clarke, the artful Mrs. Clarke, is now, I believe, little more than thirty years of age. It may be, that the race of royalty, like trees and plants of the superior kind, require more time to bring them to maturity; but, then, let it be observed, that the Duke has had the *command of the army* for 12 or 13 years past, and that the argument of superior kind cuts deeper against

him than for him.—If I were, at my age, to set up a defence upon the ground of *infatuation*, of being blinded by the *passion of love*, would not the world laugh in my face? Would they not hoot me off? Would they not turn up their noses and the palms of their hands against me?—As to the *confidence*, which Mr. Perceval, in the close of his Address, expressed, “that his royal highness would keep in view the uniformly virtuous, and exemplary conduct of his majesty, since the commencement of his reign,” not knowing any thing personally of the conduct here spoken of, I do not pretend to offer any opinion with respect to the general power and tendency of that example, upon the efficacy of which Mr. Perceval seems to place so much reliance; but, taking it for granted, that the example is what Mr. Perceval describes it to be, it can have escaped no one, that the Duke has had this example before him for the last forty-six years; and, whether it is likely, that the example will now begin its operation upon him, is a question that I readily leave to the reader.—Before I quit this part of the subject, I cannot suppress the regret that I feel at perceiving, that, amongst many people, and those, too, who ought to know much better, the Duke, is thought worse of for keeping a mistress than for any other part of the conduct imputed to him. This argues a most miserable, unmanly, pitiful way of thinking; it argues, that we are, as a correspondent expresses himself, “a dwarfed nation; that our virtues, as well as our vices, are all diminutive.” Not that I would justify, or excuse, or palliate, the conduct of an adulterer, and especially of an open adulterer, and one, too, whose example was likely to have so mischievous an effect; but this vice, great as it is, under any circumstances, and especially under such circumstances, sinks out of sight; it becomes not worthy of notice, when compared to the smallest of the acts of corruption, of low, villainous, dirty corruption, that have been, with what truth the reader will judge, imputed to the Duke of York. As to the former, there may, in some cases, exist causes that the world cannot know; but, there can exist no cause, other than that of sheer baseness of nature, for a man's doing that which has been imputed to the Duke, with regard to the trafficking in commissions and the like.—In the debate of the 17th, Mr. ELLISON is reported to have “declared his conviction, upon the whole of the evidence taken together,

"that the Duke had been *priy to the whole of the transaction.*" Now, if this was the conviction upon the mind of any man, of what consequence, compared to it, could be the circumstance of the *adultery*?

Amongst the speeches most admired by me, during the prior discussion, was that of MR. CERWEN. It was bold, and yet temperate. It led the way in good sentiments, and did the speaker infinite honour. —In the debate of the 17th, the public will not fail to have seen a proof of great public virtue as well as of excellent good sense, in the speech of GENERAL FERGUSON, who is an officer of great merit; who, for his conduct at Vimiera, recently received the thanks of the House; and who plainly said, that, in his opinion, "it was *not* for *the honour of the army*, that the chief command should remain in the hands of the *Duke of York.*" This opinion; aye, this single opinion, will weigh down a thousand addresses from the "*Military Club,*" in London, and of which Club we shall see more by-and-by.

I wish to notice, in a most particular manner, the speech of MR. LYTTLETON, on the 17th; but, I must, in order to shew the application of a very interesting part of it, first go back to MR. CANNING's speech of the 15th, in which there are several things to notice. "A noble lord (Folkestone) had, on a former night, spoken with some asperity on what had fallen from him on the outset of this inquiry. He DENIED that he had said that infamy must attach to the *accused* or the *accuser*, though he did say that it must rest somewhere; and it did rest with *that confederacy*, of which the Duke of York had been the dupe and the victim. As he had in one instance been misrepresented by addition, he had in another been misrepresented by curtailment. When he said that some men might be led to doubt whether the licentiousness of the press did not overbalance its benefits, he had added, that the *evil was temporary, but the good permanent.*" — Now, whether the reporters did, or did not, misrepresent Mr. Canning as to these two points; these two very important points; I cannot take upon me to assert, because I was not present to hear the words uttered; but, in the news-papers, which I saw, there was a perfect agreement in the reports as to these points; and, the public will have observed, that, it is not *once or twice*, but many times, that the words, respecting the charge of *infamy*, have been repeated; have been thrown in the teeth of MR. CAN-

NING; and that, until in this last speech, he has never denied them, or given any explanation of them. On the explanation now given Lord Folkestone said: "With respect to the *supposed* assertion of the right hon. gent. of the charge of *infamy* attaching to the *accuser* or the *accused*—in what I said, I argued on the *supposition* that such an expression had escaped the right hon. gentleman. As however, he has so pointedly *disclaimed* and *disavowed* the expression, my observation must naturally fall to the ground. I, however, beg leave to say, that it was not from any *document* that I founded the presumption of his having used the expression—but upon what *I thought I had heard with my own ears*; it however appears from the statement of the right hon. gentleman, that I must have been mistaken, and therefore I shall not notice the subject further at this time than to express my surprise and regret, that the right hon. gent. did not take the earliest opportunity of denying the use of the expression, especially as I have not been wanting in affording him such opportunities." Indeed, his lordship had frequently called upon him; and once, in a more particular manner, as the reader will have observed, at the opening of Kennet, the *loan-maker's case*, when he complained, that Mr. Wardle had proceeded with the threat of infamy hanging over his head, in case of failure, and that that threat remained unretracted up to that very hour. Again, in his speech in the debates, he repeated what he had said before. Sir Francis Burdett, in his speech also noticed it, and that, too, in a manner to move a stone to speak. Yet, not a word of denial did we hear from the lips of Mr. Canning.—So! He said, it seems, that the *infamy* must rest "*somewhere*," he did say *that*; and now it does rest, he says, "with the *confederacy*, of which the Duke of York had been the dupe and the victim." Dupe! Oh, O! what a commander in chief a "dupe?" A man a dupe, old enough to be a grand-papa! A dupe at 45 years of age! A grey-headed dupe! This must be another "misrepresentation," to be sure, especially after all that we have heard of the great vigilance of the Duke of York, and of his surprizing capacity for managing great affairs, and for discriminating characters.—Conspiracy is now become *confederacy*. A milder term; for a confederacy may exist for very wise and good purposes. But, really, it is somewhat sickening to hear, in

this case, even of a confederacy, after not the smallest traces of any combination, of any sort, have been discovered to have existed against the Duke of York. Every exertion has been made to discover such traces, and all have failed. Not a single jacobin has been ferretted out, though all the old regular traders in anti-jacobinism have been put in motion. No, no, Mr. Canning, there is no confederacy. Mr. Whitbread gave you a true and very beautiful description of the *cant of jacobinism*. There lies the source of the danger, and you may be assured, that you will find no trace of it any where else. To have found out a club of politicians, with *books and papers*, would have been worth a jew's eye, just at this time; but, there is no such thing. There are not the means even of hatching a plot. The old, scrubbed, battered writers about anti-jacobinism cannot earn salt to the meat that is given them. Nobody will read their trash; and, in time, they must absolutely die of hunger. They have made many attempts to revive jacobinism; but they have all failed. They had found anti-jacobinism such a thriving trade, that they were loath to give it up. Buonaparté, when he put a crown upon his head, put an end to their calling. It was impossible, after that, to keep it up. They laboured hard to do it; but it was too disgusting, when all the world saw that the tide was turned into the current of military despotism.—As to the expressions about the Press, there might be a *misperception*; but, then, we must allow, that the agreement of the reports was unfortunate here again; and, what is more material, that the expression was, if it was as it now stands explained, without any meaning; absolutely without common sense. “The evil was *temporary*, “but the good *permanent*.” We say this of taking medicine; we say it some times of political commotions; the existence of which are temporary. But, the press is *always* in existence, and *always* liable to be “licentious.” Unless, therefore, Mr. Canning should be able to make it appear, that there are certain periodical returns of “licentiousness” in the press, his amended expression, or explained expression, has no meaning. He gets rid of the offensiveness of it; but he also gets rid of the sense.—As to the case of the Duke of York, as treated by Mr. Canning, if the several reports be correct, it received very little benefit indeed. The gentleman dealt most in the high strain of rank and prerogative. He approved

of Mr. Perceval's Address, because, he said: “it was couched in language at once ‘respectful to the dignity, and tender to ‘the feelings of his majesty.’ That alone ‘was sufficient to recommend it. For on ‘such an occasion, when the father as ‘well as the sovereign was to be address-‘ed, would not every loyal mind figure ‘to itself the peculiar circumstances of ‘the monarch on the throne. On sub-‘mitting such a consideration to him, ‘must they not be impressed by the idea ‘of the *advanced age*; of the *inseparable infirmities*; of the exemplary life, and ‘the many virtues of that illustrious per-‘sonage, who, during the whole course ‘of a long reign, had evinced towards ‘the country such *paternal feelings*.”—These are topics, upon which to touch with a tender hand; but, these words I find published, in print; upon these words I will comment; and, if they elicit any thing that may give pain, let the consequence be upon the head of the publisher. Mr. Tierney, when they were uttered, did, it seems, call to order, observing, that the king's name was used, in order to influence the House; and, will not the same objection apply to the publishing of them? —Let me ask, then, how, in what manner, a king can evince *paternal feelings* towards the country? It is easy to talk of *paternal feelings*; to call a king the “father of his “people;” and so on; but, let us come to the point of *practice*; let us come to the acts. Now, the only way, in which, as far as I am able to discover, for a king to evince such feelings, is, in sparing the purses of the people, and in most carefully watching, that they be not robbed and plundered by any of those, who are in authority under him. I do not, under this interpretation, contradict the article I have quoted above; I do not say, that the king has *not*, thus, evinced his “*paternal feelings*” towards the country; but, I do say, that, when the having evinced such feelings was advanced as an argument in discussion, when it was used as an argument in justification of one Address proposed to the House, I could have wished to see a statement of the premises.—As to *age* and *infirmity*; if these are to weigh in the decision of great and important matters before the House, uncertain and lamentable indeed is our situation! “The king never dies;” nor can the law know any thing about the king's age and infirmities. The objectors to kingly government, when they dwell upon the dangers to be apprehended from *age*, *infirmities*, and *illness*, are

answered, that they are to leave all these out of the question; for, that the constitution takes care, that *no wrong* shall arise from them, the king always having "responsible" ministers; but, here, we see, that these fine theories are cast aside, and the House is desired to look at the age and infirmities of the king. What would the people say, if you were to tell them, that they were under the rule of age and infirmities? What would be the sentence upon any one of us writers, if we were to tell the people, that their affairs were left to be directed by age and infirmities? We deny this. We say, that the constitution gives us a security against the effects of age and infirmity in the king; but, Mr. Canning, one of the *king's servants*, bids the House of Commons look at the age and infirmities of the king, when they are about to pass a resolution relative to one of his own family; and, what is to be remarked is, that the measure he recommends, he does recommend upon the ground of its being calculated to *please* the king; that is to say, to please a person, whom he describes to be laboring under age and infirmities.

—Towards the close of his speech, Mr. Canning is reported to have alluded to some anecdote relative to an ancestor of Lord Folkestone. The speech appears to have been much abridged; but the words, as I find them, are these: "In the whole history of Addresses, such a one as this had never been framed by the heart of man, nor had the like ever before been presented to the House. It said no more nor less than this, 'We believe him to be guilty, but if he should happen to be innocent, we will still punish him as if guilty.' He hoped, however, such an Address of negatives would not be permitted to stand on the Journals of the House. The hon. gentleman who brought forward the charges had devised one of his own; but he had suffered others to interfere; and to inoculate or vaccinate it with matter of their producing; which had warped it from its natural purpose, and made it differ from itself. *Some of those* who had thus interfered, might have derived their presumption and pertinacity by an inheritance of the splendid vices of *one of the mistresses of George II.*" — Upon this part of the speech, Lord Folkestone said: "On the subject, Sir, of the insinuation which the right hon. gent. has made, respecting transactions that took place before those from whom I derive my existence were born, it would be affectation in me to

"pretend that I do not understand the force and tendency of this allusion. The House shewed, by the general laugh which followed, that it was generally understood. That allusion, Sir, has been grounded not on any fact that has been proved, but on mere rumours, the truth of which those most interested and most desirous to discover the truth, have never yet been able to ascertain. He has thrown out these insinuations, either to influence my conduct or to attach some blame upon myself. If the motive be to influence my conduct, and that, too, by the allusion to transactions which took place before those to whom I am indebted for my existence, were born, I beg leave to ask the House in what view my conduct ought to be influenced by transactions, in which I thus had, and could have, no concern? If the object be to attach blame to me, I will only say, that we are told, that the Almighty visits the sins of the fathers upon their children to the third and fourth generation, but that I did not expect, that even that right hon. gentleman would have arrogated to himself such a power. I will leave it to the House to judge, not only of the fairness, the candour, the liberality, of the right hon. gent. but even of the decency of—[Here the Speaker interfered, by stating, with great mildness, that he would put to the noble lord the propriety of desisting from the course of explanation he was pursuing, as it certainly had for its object *direct personality* against the right hon. gent.—Much tumult ensued, and the Speaker expressed his hope that the House would interpose in such a manner as to express its opinion.]—Lord Folkestone resumed. "Sir, I will merely add, that I will put it to the judgment and moderation of this House to decide upon the fairness; the candour; the liberality; the decency; and the justice, of the personal allusions made by the right hon. gentleman." — Thus this matter dropped for that time, and somebody, I forget who, complimented Mr. Canning upon the *temper*, which he had discovered in the debate. His speech, it was observed, had, in itself, nothing very rich or rare, but the temper, with which it was delivered, was admirable.—On the 17th, however, the HONOURABLE MR. LYTTLETON revived this topic. "He adverted to some expressions which had fallen from the Secretary for foreign affairs the other evening respecting the origin of certain gentlemen in that House.

"The right hon. gent. had assailed them "through the medium of *old and obscure anecdotes respecting their ancestors*. Mr. Lyttleton beseeched the right hon. gent. "not to attack them by a species of warfare, in which they met him ON SUCH UNEQUAL TERMS (*loud laughter*), "considering the PECULIAR SPLENDOR of his own ancestry (*a roar of laughter*). He was really forced to guard himself against the attacks of the right hon. Secretary in this way, as, from what he said on a former night, he knew "of what he was capable."—What could Mr. Lyttleton mean? I cannot say, that Mr. Canning is any favourite of mine; but, really as to his birth, I must say, that, from what I have always heard, he is descended from persons, who filled very exalted stations, and who acted their several parts as well as most people. But, if, instead of being so descended, he had been the spurious offspring of some filthy black-guard amour, what would that tell against him; especially in the liberal minds of the House of Commons, who had appeared to think, that Samuel Carter's being a natural child was a circumstance that told greatly in favour of his promotion to the army from behind the chair of Mrs. Clarke, who, by so many of the members, has been called an "infamous woman?" I wish, therefore, that Mr. Lyttleton had *explained himself a little more fully*; or else the reporters have not done their duty; for, what was that "*roar of laughter*" for? What was the meaning of it? And, I must say, that Mr. Canning's remarks of the propensity of the world to *carp at high rank* had but too much force in it. Kings and Dukes and Queens and Princesses, so many of whom, he has, from his very infancy, been accustomed to see and to know, must be more justly estimated by him than by the low and vulgar herd. Hence, too, we may easily account for the uncommon zeal, which he has discovered in the cause of Spain, or, rather of Ferdinand VII. It is quite delightful to hear his sentiments against the usurpation of the *upstarts*, who have been endeavouring to enslave "the universal Spanish nation;" the ardent, I had almost said, the holy zeal, which he has displayed against the *men of yesterday*, who wished to overturn every thing ancient and noble. He appears to have been very properly impressed with the truth of the French proverb, "Il vaut mieux qu' une cité périsse, "qu' un gueux parvenu la gouverne;" which, indeed, contains little more than our own old saying: "Set a beggar on

"horse-back, and he 'll ride to the devil." He seems to have made just observation upon the cause as well as consequences of the ruling by upstarts, for which, indeed, the fate of Spain, under Godoy, has furnished him with an excellent opportunity; no wonder, therefore, that we are called upon to "spend our *last shilling* and shed "the *last drop of our blood*," in order to keep out the upstart Buonapartés and their upstart generals, who were born nobody knows where, when, or of whom; those "children of many fathers;" those "spurious pledges, of beggars, littering under "hedges;" creatures actually dropped, and left, like the young of the cuckoo, to be nurtured by the compassion of others. There are few things that sting the soul more sharply than to be obliged to submit to the insolent sway of these "gueux parvenus;" and, there are few sacrifices that men of any spirit will not make to avoid, or get rid of, such degrading submission.

Mr. LYTTLETON's speech, except in the want of explicitness upon the above point, was very good indeed. He expressed his conviction, "that these charges against the Duke of York were fully proved, if "not according to the technical forms of "the law, at least according to the plain "sense of every unprejudiced man. The "evidence, upon the whole, he considered "as conclusive; and in opposition to that "there was nothing on the other side but "surmises and hypotheses, and the assertion "of his Royal Highness. He could not but "feel the weight of the testimony of his "gallant friend behind him (General Ferguson), with respect to the improvements in the management of the army, "effected by his royal highness the Duke "of York; but he must observe, at the "same time, that *mere evidence to character* "could only be urged with effect in mitigation of punishment. He could not erase "from his recollection the methods taken "by the other side to counteract these accusations, in raising the cry of Jacobinism, "and in prejudging the question. This "was suspicious; but it was not very judicious, and he doubted whether if that eloquent magician (Mr. Pitt) who first raised the *Phantom of Jacobinism*, could again be equally successful. An attempt, "let what would be done to explain it away, has been made to decry the liberty of the press. He allowed that the House was not to be actuated by popular clamour. But, at the same time, it was "very unreasonable in ministers to say,

" that those were influenced merely by " popular opinion who did not concur " with them. It would have had a better " appearance if the ministers had not been " quite so unanimous on this question. Our " ancestors had a salutary distrust of per- " sons in office ; and in order to prove " this, he read some resolutions passed " in former times, to render members of " parliament incapable, while acting in " that capacity, of holding any other situa- " tion.—If it were in the power of the " House to send down to posterity the cha- " racter of the Duke of York unsullied, if " their proceedings did not extend beyond " their Journals, he should be almost in- " clined to concur in the vote of acquittal, " even in opposition to his sense of duty. " But though the House should acquit his " Royal Highness, the proofs would still re- " main, and the public opinion would be " guided by them, and not by the decision " of the House. It was in the power " of the House to save its own character, " but not that of the Commander in Chief. " The character of the House depended " essentially upon the result of this in- " quiry. If it was contrary to what the " public conceived the justice of the case, " they would be apt to lose all confidence " in the members, they would imagine " that the ministers had it in their power " to carry every thing—that there was no " security for them in the house of com- " mons against the arbitrary disposition of " the servants of the crown—and perhaps " they might be driven by other means to " seek those ends of justice which their " representatives had denied them. He, " however, hoped better of the virtue and " wisdom of the House, which he hoped " would, like the fountain of justice, prove " itself to be no respecter of persons."— This speech was received with great applause, which I look upon as a good sign. Aye, the magician, Pitt, would surely fail now, in any attempt to conjure up the phantom of jacobinism. That man of words would now find that the public mind is no longer so to be led. That the people of this country are no longer to be made believe, that every man is a traitor, who suspects that there is corruption on foot; that every man ought to die on a gallows, who does not cheerfully subscribe to the infallibility of the minister of the day. There is no want of the talents of Pitt; they are possessed by many of his followers, who can speak as long and full as well as he; but, there are wanted the materials to work upon. The nation has be-

taken itself to thinking; it has become a fashion, among the people, to be no longer amused by sounds; things, ideas, and not words, are now the object of their attention. Within these ten years, there has been a mental revolution in this country. I should like to see what Pitt would be able to do, with all his talk, now. Indeed, he tried the thing in the last years of his life, and he failed. Death snatched him from as complete discomfiture and mortification as ever man experienced. His budget had been all tried, over and over. There was not a trick left, that the people had not blown upon.

In this debate of the 17th, there is a published speech attributed to a Mr. FULLER, who is reported to have said, that if there was any one "Who did not like Eng- " land, damn him, let him leave it." The mind of the person, who uttered, or who wrote, these words, appears not to have partaken in the revolution above spoken of. It seems to have remained stationary, like the sterile and unseeded elod, amidst the improvements, the beauties, and the delights of heaven-bestowed vegetation. He, though his body has increased in age, and has advanced towards the hour of dissolution, seems to be, in mind, still living in the days of Pitt, in the days when anti-jacobinism was a thriving trade, and he one of its best customers.—Aye, this was the old cry : "if you do not like "the country, leave it." But, the words must be explained: by the country they mean the government, and by the government they mean the ministry, and, in Pitt's time, by the ministry, they meant Pitt; so that the sentiment should stand thus, fairly reduced to its true meaning, "If you "do not like the ministry, quit the country." No, Mr. Fuller, I will not leave the country, I will not leave England, upon any such principle as this. I like England very well; and, to say the least, I shew full as much love for it as you do. But I do not like corruption; I do not like to see the offices under the government, and the seats in the House of Commons, openly advertised for purchase and sale. The corruptions, "damn them," to borrow a phrase of your own; the corruptors and the corrupted, "damn them," I hate them most cordially! But, I do not hate England; on the contrary, it is my love of England that makes me hate them. Why, Sir, what would you think of the logic of a gang of thieves, who should have got possession of a man's house, and who, upon hearing him complain of their con-

duct, were to say, If you don't like the house, "damn" you, leave it? Now, mind, I do not compare you, and those whom you support, to a gang of thieves; mind that; let me not be misunderstood; but, I use the illustration merely to shew to what length this abusive argument, which the news-papers, with one accord, have attributed to you, would naturally, and necessarily go.—If, indeed, you could bring me a man, who should say: "I do 'not like *England*," without any qualification of his meaning, I should then say, without the "damn him," perhaps, (though I will not be very positive about that), "let him leave it." But, my opinion is, that you never heard an Englishman make use of this expression; and, give me leave to say, that the occasion, and the context, of this sentiment of yours, as published in the papers, lead me to conclude, that by *England*, you did not mean our *country*, as being the object of any one's dislike.—I have noticed this speech, not on account of its intrinsic importance, but as affording an occasion of pointing out the intolerance, the injustice, and the insolence of the principle (first broached in the days of Pitt), that all those, who are discontented with the mode of managing public affairs, may *leave the country*; have the precious liberty, the glorious privilege, of seeking redress in voluntary transportation for life. I wonder what Hampden and his associates would have said, if the besotted Charles's courtiers had answered their complaints by telling them that they might leave the country. Why, they would have said what was said to his bigot and profligate of a son. "No: England 'is ours and *not yours*: leave you Eng-land to us." They were not so to be answered. They knew their rights, and had the courage to assert them.—This doctrine ascribed to Mr. Fuller, would, if generally applied, save a great deal of trouble to ministers; it would furnish a standing answer to all petitions, all remonstrances, all complaints of grievances of every sort. "Oh, you don't like Eng-land, don't you," why then, "damn 'you, leave it." It would be a complete stifler; a choaker equal to a halter at least.—It appears to have been, through the whole of the debates, admitted, that the people of this country in general, if not quite without exception, thought the continuance of the Duke of York in the office of Commander-in-Chief of the army, a grievance. This, called by one side, popular clamour, appears to have been urged

by some, and to be denied by none.—It is not impertinent, or unnecessary, to ask, *why* the people should have set up this clamour, if clamour it must be? *What* should have produced this unanimity of voice and of wish in the nation? For *what reason* a whole people should have thus combined against one man? Well, supposing there to have been no reason at all; supposing this whole nation to have been, and still to be, in this respect, under the influence of senseless caprice; still it must be, that this dislike to the Duke has arisen out of the Inquiry, or that it existed before: if the former, it shews what effect the evidence has produced upon the minds of the people; if the latter, that they never had any confidence in him. This dislike, too, might have no other foundation than senseless caprice; but, yet, if you allow it to have generally existed, it comes, at last, to the same thing, with regard to the application of Mr. Fuller's argument, which would go to the bidding of them all, "damn them," to leave the country.—Lord William Russell, in the debate of the 17th, regretted the loss of that laudable custom of our forefathers, who, *before they voted money to the king*, insisted upon a *redress of grievances*; but, upon the principle of Mr. Fuller's speech, the king should have said to them, "if you don't like *England*, 'damn you, leave it.'" It is not long since another speech, published under the name of this Mr. Fuller, told us, "that 'the Chancellor of the Exchequer had 'proved, that the Duke of York had, during 'the space of two years and a half, spent 'sixteen thousand pounds upon a profligate 'baggage, and if that would not satisfy 'the House and the people, he did not 'know what would.'" If this did not satisfy them, "damn them," they might leave the country, I suppose?—Mr. Fuller's language, *openly* used at least, has something singular in it; but, I, by no means, believe, that he is singular in his opinions, or in his language, as used not before the public. There are, in my opinion, many who think what he says, and who, to one another, give utterance to their thoughts. But, I trust, the time is now come, when no one will be able to act with impunity upon such a principle; when no one will dare to spurn the people, when they make their complaints of grievances, and to tell them, either in acts or words, that, "damn them," they may leave the country.

In the debate of the 17th, there came

out, through Mr. Whitbread, a statement relative to a certain MILITARY CLUB, who were preparing an *Address to the Duke of York*. This being a matter of great importance to the public, as a practical illustration of the arguments that have been frequently used relative to the influence of so large a standing army, all the officers of which are not only appointed solely by the king, but any one of whom can, at any moment, and without cause assigned, be dismissed, deprived of his profession, and, perhaps, of his bread, by the sole will of the king, no minister whatever being held, even nominally, responsible for any act of this sort; this instance of the military club affording such practical illustration, I shall insert, in the fullest manner that I find it reported, what was said upon the subject in the House of Commons.—Mr. WHITBREAD said, “There was a very strange circumstance had come to his ears, with which he felt it incumbent on him to acquaint the house, and that was, that within these few days a meeting had taken place of General Officers, at which meeting it was proposed to address the Duke of York, on the present occasion, and to assure his Royal Highness of their gratitude and attachment. To what could the proceedings of such a meeting lead. If a number of General Officers were allowed thus to hold meetings and deliberate, why might not common soldiers imitate their proceedings, and sit in deliberation also? Was this a circumstance to be overlooked by the House? Was it not one of the most dangerous tendency? Was it not an attempt to erect an *imperium in imperio*, to interfere in the deliberative proceedings of that House, and to answer its arguments by fixed bayonets? He trusted it would be sufficient thus to have warned the House of the existence of such a meeting. The hon. gentleman concluded by observing, that what had transpired in the course of the present investigation into the conduct of the Duke of York, furnished a new proof, if any additional proof were wanting, of the necessity of a temperate reform, a reform which would extend not only to the administration of the army, but to the Government in Church and State.”—This last observation we must reserve for a future opportunity, with just observing now, that to this many men who never thought much of the matter before, have now made up their minds. They see, that without such a reform as was here spoken

of by Mr. Whitbread, there can very little good arise from any inquiry; any partial detection, exposure, or even punishment of corruptions and peculations; that you may cut down a shoot here and there, and even the whole stem; but, that it will throw out again, and even with renovated vigour; and that nothing worth prizes is done, until you have laid the axe to the root.—In answer to what Mr. Whitbread said about the *Military Club*, the Secretary at War, SIR JAMES PULTENEY, said “that he thought himself called upon to say a few words respecting the meeting of General Officers to which the honourable gentleman had alluded. There was some foundation for the statement of the honourable gentleman, but it was only this, that there existed in this town a club of Military Gentlemen, of which he was an unworthy Member. That club had lately met; and, at the meeting, some conversation had arisen, respecting the conduct of the Duke of York, as Commander in Chief. That conversation turned upon the services rendered by his Royal Highness to the Army; and the Members of the Club thought themselves bound in gratitude to testify to his Royal Highness the high sense they entertained of the eminent advantages which the army had derived from his able administration of the military affairs of the country. These sentiments they had resolved to express to his Royal Highness in the form of an *Address*, but their proceedings in this respect, had no reference whatsoever to the circumstances of the present moment, or to what was now passing in that House.”—No! “No reference whatsoever to the circumstances of the present moment?” This is very strange indeed; still stranger than the existence of an intention to send the address. Did the Club ever address him before? Did they ever think of this upon any former occasion? Oh! So the Club had lately happened to meet; and some conversation had arisen respecting the conduct of the Duke of York, as Commander in Chief of the Army. Yes, to be sure, all about soldiering, as the Volunteers call it; all about soldiering, and then the conversation, amongst these military men constituting a Club in London, turned, aye, it happened to turn, upon the services rendered by his Royal Highness to the army. That is all very good; very good, very “correct,” as the new phrase is. But, I cannot help stopping here; “I cannot help interrupting my argument,” as Lord Castlereagh some-

times facetiously observes, to notice that these military gentlemen are always talking about the Duke's *services* to the army. What is meant by this? We should like to hear of services to the country, performed by means of the army. These men themselves make a part of the army, and a part, too, which was not out of the way when the services were shared, I will warrant you. Well; but, "to go on with my argument," as Lord Castlereagh says; and so, the conversation happening to have turned upon the services rendered to the army, by the Duke of York, in his capacity of Commander in Chief, the Club, amongst whom were the Secretary at War, one of the ministry of the day, and a member of parliament, thought themselves bound in gratitude to present an address to the Duke; and, though this resolution of theirs was taken just at the time, that a question respecting the Duke's removal was before the House of Commons, this proceeding of the Club had "no reference whatsoever to the circumstances of the present moment, or to what was now passing in the House;" and so, it was all very well, and the fighting gentry were doing very right, and certainly meant nothing at all, not the least in the world, in the way of dragooning.—This puts one in mind of Scut's *ex parte* examination of his client in the Village Lawyer. "And so, the sheep run after you, and would insist upon being killed . . . Ye—, yes, I see, I see. And did you carry away the sheep, or the sheep carry you?" —After all, however, it appears, that there is, in London, an establishment, called "the Military Club," that the members of that club do meet and deliberate; and that, amongst their deliberations, there has been one, the result of which was, a resolution to present an Address to the Duke of York expressive of their *approbation* of his conduct. Now, it will hardly be contended, that, if they have a right to do this, and it be proper for them to do this, the soldiers, in their several regiments, have not a similar right; and, as it would be too base to be tolerated for a moment, to contend that the right of expressing their sentiments, in this manner, to their superior officers, extended only as far as they went in the way of *approbation*, it follows, of course, that, unless this basest of base principles be avowed, that the soldiers have as good a right to meet, to deliberate, and to pass censure upon the commanding officers of their several corps, as these men have to address the Duke of York, which men, observe, in presenting an address of appro-

bation, tacitly assert their right to express their *disapprobation*, of the conduct of the same person. We have heard a great deal of the surprisingly excellent *discipline*, which the Duke of York has introduced into the army. The Secretary of War was himself one of the witnesses to character upon this score; and now, I think, he has obliged us with a practical instance of the truth of his statements.—In the debate of the 20th, Mr. Whitbread brought the subject forward again. This part of his speech, together with what was said by others, on the same subject, I shall now insert.—Mr. WHITBREAD said "that he had a few words to state on the subject of a meeting of General Officers, to which he had referred on a former night. He said that the idea of the resolution which he had understood to have been come to by that meeting was not so entirely put down as had been stated, though indeed, he confessed, he had now no dread from it. He was now informed, that the proposal made at that meeting had been grounded on a letter from a Garrison Commander, and was drawn out in the hand-writing of Sir David Dundas. He was now even given to understand, that the proposition had been seconded by the right honourable general opposite (the Secretary at War), and that it was in consequence of the opposition of one General Officer present that it was withdrawn for the moment; not entirely set aside, but to be brought forward again on some future opportunity. The hon. gent. had been informed yesterday, by a very respectable person, a book-seller, who, he believed, was known to most of the gentlemen on the other side, that a clergyman had called on him, requesting that he would recommend to him a literary gentleman to correct a letter to be addressed to his royal highness by the Club of General Officers, telling him that he would do wrong were he to resign his situation. The bookseller, however, very properly desired the rev. gentleman to take back the address to the General Officer from whom he had received it, assuring him that the publication of such a paper was the most foolish step that could possibly be adopted. He had been told that there could no harm result from such meetings. He dared to say the fact was so, and that, as Cæsar stopped his tumultuous legions, simply by using the word 'Quirites,' it would be only necessary to remind them that they were soldiers. The hon. gent. declared his

"opinion, that a national sentiment prevailed that the son of the king was not a fit person to be Commander in Chief. The present inquiry had demonstrated that it was not fit that the son of the king should hold that situation. The house had been engaged in this inquiry from the 1st of February to the 20th of March. We, of course, saw the ease with which the son of the king could be removed from his situation. When the charges were first brought forward, gentlemen on the other side had stepped forward, and challenging the hon. mover to the inquiry, had said, "Oh! now at length you have come in a tangible shape; and we thank you for giving us an opportunity of meeting the charges." When the hon. gent. however, had proved his charges, he was told he was to have no thanks at all. For these reasons he thought the son of the king was not a fit person to hold such a situation. There was a time when the favourite son of a king had not been so treated. In a former reign when the Duke of Cumberland gave offence by concluding the convention of Clester Severn, he was at once removed and disgraced. Though he (Mr. Whitbread) was not prepared to say, that the hon. gent. who brought forward these charges ought to receive the thanks of the house, because in so doing he had only discharged his duty, he was satisfied that he had the thanks of the great majority of that house, and of 999 out of every 1000 individuals throughout the kingdom.—THE SECRETARY AT WAR said, he had only to repeat what he had said on a former night on the subject of the Club of General Officers. From the statement of the hon. member that the proceeding was founded on a letter of a Garrison Commander, one would think that a formal address had been proposed; this, however, was not the case. It was merely the subject of conversation, whether it might be proper to pass a resolution of thanks to the Duke of York then or at any other time. Nothing farther was done; so it was unnecessary for him to say that he did not second a proposition which had never been made. So far from it, no intimation of such a proposal was made till the cloth was removed from the table. It was then talked of, and it was agreed that at all events such a measure would not be advisable till the conclusion of the discussion now going on in the House of Commons. There were at the time only thirteen gentlemen present, and the proposition

was not received with acclamations. As to any thing further on the subject, he was as ignorant of it as if he had not been present.—MR. WHITBREAD said, he understood the paper, on which the proposition was founded, was in the handwriting of Sir David Dundas. There were gentlemen now in the House who were present when the information was given to him, and they could state that this was the fact as he had received it. He begged to say one other word. He should be happy to hear from the Secretary at War if the proposition was now abandoned?—THE SECRETARY AT WAR said he had seen no paper in the handwriting of Sir D. Dundas. As to the other question, he could not say if the proposition was abandoned or not—MR. CANNING said, when he first heard of the circumstance alluded to by the hon. gent. (Mr. Whitbread), he stated, that it had his most decided disapprobation, as being one of the most improper steps which the army could adopt. If there did exist an attempt on the part of any Military Officers to protect the Duke of York against the Commons, a more culpable idea never entered into the heads of men. But, on the other hand, if it was only a simple conversation at a convivial meeting, he saw no occasion to swell it up into a matter of importance. If, however, the idea of making it a formal resolution of Military Officers as a deliberative body should at any time be entertained, the hon. gent. (Mr. Whitbread) should find him one of his most determined supporters in inquiring into the business.—MR. WHITBREAD again stated, that he had been informed the paper had been read before dinner; and if thought necessary this fact might be inquired into.—GENERAL LOFTUS, referring to the club of General Officers, stated that he himself was not present, but that he had inquired into the particulars of a friend who was present, and the information he received was, that there was no paper produced, that the subject was started in a moment without any formality, and was carried on and dropt like any other conversation.”—This comes as nearly up, as it can well come, to one of those arts, described in the vulgar but most beautiful and forcible figure of *drawing in the horns*. One can almost see the head drooping, and the soft member, gently, and, as it were by stealth, retreating to its intrenchments, and coiling itself snugly up.—There is one

thing, however, which I would wish the public to bear in mind, in connection with the existence of this Military Club; and that is, that a very considerable part of the army, officers as well as men, consists of *foreigners*; I say, *consists of foreigners*. Now, if these foreign officers compose, in part, this club, and if this club, (held in London,) is to deliberate in the way that has been described, I leave the public to say what is the nature of our situation. Had I been a member of parliament, I should certainly have called for the names of all those composing this association. Societies amongst *the people of England*, for deliberating upon public matters, are, I believe, forbidden by one of the laws, passed in the time of Pitt; and, are these officers of the army to meet, then, and deliberate? And deliberate, too, upon such important questions, as that which was then before the House of Commons? This Military Club should recollect, that they are paid by the nation for the purpose of obtaining from them *military services*; that the army costs this burdened people 23 millions of pounds sterling a year; and that it is, or ought to be, expected from its generals, that they will busy themselves about other matters than making addresses to the sons of the king.

Having now noticed such parts of the Debates, up to Friday, the 17th, inclusive, that appeared to me the most worthy of immediate attention, I shall come to the proceedings of the 20th, beginning with the statement of Mr. Perceval respecting the Duke of York's having resigned the office of Commander in Chief. He said, that this took place on Saturday last, and that it was the Duke's own "*spontaneous motion*," founded upon the motives set forth in a paper, which Mr. Perceval then read to the House in the following words: "The House of Commons having, after a "most attentive and laborious investigation of the merits of certain allegations "preferred against him, passed a Resolution "of his innocence, he might now approach his Majesty, and might venture "to tender to him his Resignation of the "Chief Command of his Majesty's Army, "as he could no longer be suspected of "acting from any apprehension of the result, nor be accused of having shrunk "from the extent of an inquiry which, "painful as it had been, he trusted he "should appear, even to those who had "been disposed to condemn his conduct, "to have met with the patience and firm-

"ness which could arise only from a conscientious feeling of innocence.—The motive which influenced him arose from "the truest sense of duty, and the warmest attachment to his Majesty, from "which he had never departed, and which "his Majesty had, if possible, confirmed, "by the affectionate and paternal solicitude which he had shown for his son's honour and welfare upon the present distressing occasion. To his Majesty, as "a most kind and indulgent Father, as a "most gracious Sovereign, he owed every thing; and the feeling of this alone would "have prompted him to forego all considerations of personal interest in the determination which he had taken. It would "not become him to say that he should "not quit with sincere regret a situation "in which his Majesty's confidence and "partiality had placed him, and the duties "of which it had been his anxious study "and his pride, during fourteen years, to "discharge with integrity and fidelity. "Whether he might be allowed to add, "with advantage to his Majesty's service, "his Majesty was best able to decide."

—Mr. Perceval then suggested, that the motion of Mr. BRAGGE was become unnecessary. Mr. Bragge did not think so; but, before we go any further, let us take another look at this statement of motives.

—For my part, I have had no opportunity of witnessing the conduct of the Duke, during the Inquiry and discussion; I have seen nothing of him but in his Letter to the House, and in that I certainly discover neither *patience* nor *firmness*, though I discover enough of qualities of a very different sort.—But, "the House has," it seems, in his view of the matter, "passed a Resolution of his innocence." We have seen, in the former part of this Register, how many there were to say NO to the resolution alluded to, and the world is not ignorant of the circumstances, under which the Vote was given. But, was there ever, in all this world before, such a reason given for a man's quitting his office? Certain Charges are preferred against him, as Commander in Chief; "a Resolution of his innocence" of those charges is passed, and, this *having been done*, this Resolution having been passed, he resigns! Wonderful! Why, the world is turned upside-down.—If, indeed, the proceedings had been quite finished; then he might, with some shew of plausibility, have said: "There; they have completely acquitted me; they have passed no vote for my removal, or having that object in view;

" and I will now let them see that it was " not for my *office*, but for my *honour*, that " I made a stand." But, the fact was otherwise; the proceedings were not over; there was Mr. Bragge's motion for Monday, and it was almost reduced to a certainty, that that motion, after the passing of which he could not have remained in office, without an open rupture between the advisers of the King and a majority of the House, would have been carried by a decided majority. These were the circumstances, then, under which he resigned. —So, the occasion has been a "*distress-ing*" one, has it? This does not correspond well with the bold language, assumed, in his name, by Mr. Adam and Mr. Perceval, when the charges were first made. There was, then, a great show of *hackle*; there was nothing, amongst his partisans, but strutting and crowing. They were a main, against one cock; but, they have turned tail, and that, too, upon their own dunghill. "*Distressing occasion;*" well, then, the Duke knows, at last, what it is to feel distress himself. "*Distressing occasion!*" One cannot help hanging upon the words. There was nothing of this in the Letter to the House. Alas! I see very little of firmness here.—The expressions of *attachment to the King* have no harm in them, to be sure; but, I do not see the use of them, upon an occasion like this. No one had ever, that I know of, accused the Duke of a want of attachment to his father. It was of a want of attachment to the *public good*, that he was (with what truth the reader may decide) accused; and, in this statement of reasons, one might, without being very unreasonable; without entertaining any wish to see a member of the royal family degrade himself in the eyes of the world, have expected to meet with some expression of gratitude towards that public. To *his Majesty*, both as father and sovereign, he says he *owes every thing*. I do not wish to strain this sentence to mean, that he *owes the public nothing*; but, when I recollect how much he owes to that public; that good-natured, that generous public, I cannot say but I think that the public should not, in a paper like this, have been wholly omitted.

MR. BRAGGE, after a speech of some length, in which there was nothing worthy of our particular notice, made his motion in the following words:—" That while this House acknowledges the beneficent effects of the regulations adopted and acted upon by his Royal Highness in

" the general discharge of his duties as " Commander in Chief, it is observed with " the deepest regret, that in consequence " of a connection the most immoral and " unbecoming, a communication on official subjects, and an interference in the distribution of Military Appointments " and Promotions has been allowed to " exist, which could not but lead to dis- " credit the official administration of his Royal " Highness, and to give colour and effect, as " they have actually done, to transactions the " most criminal and disgraceful." —To this motion LORD ALTHORPE moved an Amendment, after a speech which is too good not to be inserted here as far as, at present, I am in possession of it. This conduct in Lord Althorpe, Lord Milton, Mr. Lyttleton, Lord Folkestone, and several other young men of distinguished families, must give great hope to the country.—He said: " That there were one or two positions " advanced by the right hon. gent. who " had just sat down, in which he could not " entirely concur. With regard to the re- " gret of the right hon. gent. for the resig- " nation of the Duke of York, he admitted " that it was a great loss to lose the ser- " vices of those who had while in office " efficiently discharged their duty, but the " loss of the services of the Duke of York " was considerably lessened, when they " recollect in what manner it had been " proved at their bar that Royal Duke " discharged his duty. He differed also " from that right hon. gent. as to the great " use and importance he thought proper " to attach to the elevated rank of that il- " lustrious person. He (Lord Althorpe) " was rather disposed to think that such " high rank and affinity to the throne were " not the most recommendatory qualifi- " cations for the most responsible situation " under the crown, and he appealed to " those who heard him, if, in the course of " the late proceedings, their debates were " not, in some degree, influenced by con- " siderations of delicacy, inseparable from " any discussion, involving the character " and honour of one so near his majesty; " and therefore, it did appear to him to be " of the greatest importance that no person " should ever, for the future, be called to " such high situations but such as could be " completely responsible. Another asser- " tion of the right hon. gent. went to the " total acquittal of the Duke of York, as " to corruption or connivance. It was not " necessary now, perhaps, to go into this, " but as it was mentioned, he would state, " that he did think the Duke of York had

"been proved guilty of connivance at the corrupt practices which had taken place; and if his royal highness had continued in office, he thought that the House must have gone farther, and passed a sentence upon him that would have rendered his resignation unavoidable. With regard to their subsequent proceedings, he was of opinion, that the question stood in a state in which the House of Commons ought not to suffer it to remain. He wished to place it on the Journals, that the Duke of York had resigned. This notification would give consistency to the entire character of their proceedings, and bring it to its proper close, at the same time satisfactorily accounting why it was closed. Not, however, that he would be understood to say that he considered removal from office a constitutional punishment; but it would be in this case so far effective, as to preclude the possibility of that Royal Duke being ever re-appointed to a situation he has proved himself so incompetent to fill. No man can, or ought to hold that important situation, who was not in full possession of the confidence of the country. *The Duke of York has forfeited that confidence.* He has lost the confidence of the country for ever, and by consequence he must abandon all hopes of ever again returning to that situation. This was a severe lesson, but it was as salutary as it was severe; it would prove to all who may succeed that royal Duke hereafter, that it is not within the power of any sovereign, however beloved or confided in, to protect his most favoured servant from the just consequences of the mal-administration of his public duty. The noble lord then concluded with moving, 'That his royal highness the Duke of York having resigned the command of the Army, that house did not now think it necessary to proceed any farther in the consideration of the evidence before the Committee appointed to inquire into the conduct of his royal highness, as far as that evidence related to his royal highness the Duke of York.'—

The debate then went on. Mr. Perceval objected to the word *now*; and, after a debate of considerable length, the Resolution was passed, leaving out the word *now*, which, to me, does not appear of very great importance; because, the sense seems to be fully expressed in the previous words, which contain the reason why the house does not think it necessary to proceed any further. *The Duke having resigned, &c.* is

quite sufficient. The sentence, in common language, says this, "we do not think it necessary to go on any further, because the Duke *has resigned.*" NOW could hardly be intended to mean, that it was meant to keep the thing in waiting, to see whether he again took the command. If it was, it was useless; because, proceedings can be adopted in such a case, and reference can be made to all the evidence, which has now been taken at the bar. Not that I, either, would be understood to insinuate, that *loss of office* is to be regarded as "constitutional punishment," as the Nabob's Gazette would fain make us believe it to be. This would be a pretty doctrine indeed; a pretty distinction between the service of the public and the service of an individual. The paper, which I have just mentioned, and which is, I believe, the only one in all England that has had the bare-faced profligacy to justify all the acts of the Duke of York, says he has been "*severely punished;*" forgetting, apparently, the other column of its dirty sheet, in which it contends, that the Duke's resignation was *perfectly voluntary*, and that he had no desire to retain his office. A bad cause or a bad memory is, either of them, bad enough; but when they unite they are sure to make a most ridiculous figure.

Mr. Whitbread, during this debate, charged Mr. Perceval with having *deserted* the Duke; this the latter denied, asserting, that the Duke's resignation was his own "*spontaneous motion.*" But, let any one look at the Address, prepared by Mr. Perceval, and read to the house, in the first day's debate; let him look at that address, which was little more than an echo of the Duke's Letter to the house, and then say if there has not been desertion. The public must have observed, that Mr. Perceval, Mr. Yorke, Mr. Canning, the Attorney General, Mr. Plomer, Mr. Burton, Mr. Leycester, and, indeed, all the set ministerial members, who spoke in the debate, dwelt upon the great *injury* the country would sustain in *losing* the Duke of York, as Commander in Chief. "But, it was his *own spontaneous motion.*" He would not stay in. But, why did they not get him to remain, till they had negatived *Mr. Bragge's motion?* They, surely, who had got him to wait so long, could have prevailed upon him to wait two days longer. The motion was to be made on Monday, and they could not get him to wait that time. Zounds, then! don't let him boast so much of his *patience.* Why, he must have been as impatient to get out of office

as most men are to get into office, and as he himself was, according to his pretty letter from Sandgate, to get into the arms of Mrs. Clarke, poor woman!—When the Duke sent his letter to the House, did any one suppose, that he would have made a spontaneous resignation of his office? Did that letter, either in its tone or matter, indicate the most distant idea of this sort? On the contrary, did it not, in every line, breathe defiance? Look again at Mr. Perceval's proposed Address, which is an echo to that letter, and see whether its object, its chief object, be not to tell the king, that the House will go with him in keeping the Duke of York in his place. Again look at the several speeches, on the ministerial side of the House, and see whether they did not labour principally to this point. Recollect the concluding words of the Attorney General, who gave such strong reasons for believing, that the Duke would not abuse his powers for the future. The Solicitor General said, that you might as well stab the *Duke of York* to the heart, as to pass a vote for his removal; and, though he explained this away a little afterwards, it is clear, from the remarks upon it, in the House, that so he was understood. It is, then, as clear as noon-day, that the settled purpose was to keep the Duke in his place; and, there can be no doubt, that this purpose was, at last, given up only when it was perceived, that there would have been a majority for the motion of Mr. Bragge, after passing which motion it would have been impossible for him to remain without producing an open war between a majority of the House and the King's servants.

Well, be this as it may, whatever might be the motive, *out he is*, and, so far the public wish has been gratified. But, how much better would it have been, if he had resigned at an earlier period? How much better would it have been, if, at the outset, the *servants of the king* had acted in the manner which I formerly pointed out, and which was, indeed pointed out by the nature of the case? If they had so acted, instead of fighting the Charges, inch by inch; instead of causing a clear line of distinction to be drawn between them and those persons who were not hostile to the Inquiry; if they had so acted, there would not, as there now is, be a guide to direct the public resentment whereon to fix itself. The public are pleased that the Duke of York is out of office; they are convinced that this is for their good; they are satisfied that this is a happy event.

But, whom do they thank for it? Towards whom are their grateful feelings directed? Aye it is in this that the ministers have been highly blameable. It is their fault that the public gratitude is not directed, in part, at least, in that way, in which it was their first duty to have caused it to be directed, and to produce which cause they had it completely in their power, unless it be true, that, as Mr. Whitbread stated, they were not the efficient ministers of the king. What the public has now gained they thank themselves for, next after Mr. Wardle. They see that nothing has been conceded to them, without reluctance; and even in the motives stated by Mr. Perceval, for the Duke's resignation, they find no expression, not a single word, which is calculated to awaken in them sentiments of a description, which wise ministers would have bent their whole minds to keep alive.—Jacobins, indeed! Those are the jacobins; those are the true destroyers of thrones, who omit nothing that may tend to irritate and disgust the people; who push them on to the utmost stretch of their patience.—It is useless to tell us, that the ministers had nothing to do with the *Duke's resignation*. We should as soon believe, that Mr. Perceval had nothing to do with the keeping of the secret about the note in the hands of Sandon. In short, it is quite in vain to endeavour to palliate their conduct, which, towards the people, has, from first to last, been any thing but gracious; and that the people most sensibly feel.

There was a part of the speech of Mr. Whitbread of the 20th, that did not at all square with my ideas upon the subject. It related to those great allowances, which we are to make for the failings of princes; and it did, to me, appear very much like courtly flattery, and that, too, of the worst sort.—“An hon. gent. proposed to read the Duke of York a lecture on morality. He (Mr. W.) did not think this a very fit time for such a lecture. A sufficiently long and grave one had been read to his royal highness in the course of the examination. The situation of princes was a very difficult one. They were exposed to greater temptations than others, without the same means of resistance. They almost always wanted that valuable acquisition—an admanishing friend. Such a friend was with them so rare, that to speak the truth to a prince had been always considered as a characteristic of extreme boldness. ‘He

“ ‘is a bold man this,’ it had been said, “ ‘for he has spoken the truth even to the King.’ Some allowances in a *moral* point of view were due to persons in such a situation. Another strong reason why the House should not read the Duke of York a lecture on morality was, the situation in which the princes were placed, from the necessity of the case, of *not being allowed to form those connections of the heart which were permitted to every other subject*. He did not say that this was a case in point with respect to his Royal Highness. The observation was general; but he thought it was a reason why the House should not readily *throw stones* at princes on account of their improper connections. We had, he observed, one Royal Duke whose character for morality and correct conduct, stood as high as that of any man; and, considering the circumstances to which he had alluded, the greater temptations and the difficulties attached to the situation, it would not be an easy matter to prize such a character higher than it deserved.”

—A nicer dish of flattery than this I do not recollect to have ever seen, even in a romance; it must, one would suppose, be relished even by him, who was so very delicate in his palate, that Mrs. Clarke found it frequently necessary to change her maid-cooks, of which she had a brace at a time. “A difficult situation?” In what is the situation of one of our princes *difficult*? Do they want money? Do they want for any thing, which other men have? I can see nothing that they want for, which this world can afford. Instead of being exposed to *greater temptations* than others, they seem to me to be exposed to *none* of those temptations, which form the apology for the vices of men, in common life. They have not, he tells us, “the same means of resistance.” I wish he had attempted to show this; to give us reasons for what he asserted. For my part, unless we admit their *impunity* to be *legalized*, I can see no check upon the vices of other men, which does not exist with respect to them. Indeed, this doctrine of Mr. Whitbread would go much farther than he appears to have perceived. If it be sound with respect to princes, it must, in due degree, be equally sound with regard to nobles; and, in short, rank and riches will become, in themselves, an apology, if not a justification, for vice. “From him to whom much is given, much shall be required,” says the Gospel, which,

let it remain untortured by priest-craft, always speaks the voice of justice and of common sense; but, Mr. Whitbread would reverse this great maxim, and would have us believe, that, because much is given, little ought to be required. “*Difficulty*” indeed! What difficulty is there in a prince’s living a sober, a regular, and a decent life? In well-ordering his affairs; in choosing for his companions men of sense and of good character; in keeping his expences within the bounds of moderation; in regularly and faithfully discharging all demands upon him; in keeping his word upon all occasions; in carrying himself towards the public in a manner at once gracious and dignified? What “difficulty” is there in this to a person, who has no care about providing the means of his present, or his future, support, and whose income is as sure as his existence? So far from this being difficult, that it appears to me to come to a man as naturally as his teeth or his nails; and, that, if we suppose his nature not to be radically bad, the difficulty must be in avoiding it. — As “to the want of an *admonishing friend*,” whose fault must that be? His own. If, indeed, the princes of England were, like those of Barbary, shut out from the world, there might be some force in this observation; but here they mix in society; they are free to choose their companions; there is neither law nor custom to restrain them, and they have shown us, that they know how to exercise this freedom. If, then, their friends, or the persons that approach them, the persons in whose society they delight, and whose virtues, or vices, they will be apt to imitate, be not such as Mr. Whitbread could wish, the fault is with themselves, and with themselves alone. — I think the *moral* part of the apology equally deficient in sound reason. Shall they, because the law restrains them from marrying whom they please, urge that as an excuse for not observing the obligations of matrimony, when they have voluntarily entered into it? For, there is no law to compel them to marry; and, therefore, if they ever do marry without that affection of which Mr. Whitbread speaks, so much the greater their shame. At any rate, when once married, they have, leaving the solemnity of the *vow* out of the question, entered into a compact; and, to break that compact is an act of dishonour in itself, an act of injustice and of cruelty towards the weaker party to the compact, and an injury committed against the public, against P.

every father and every mother, who have children liable to be led into vice and consequent misery by such an example. Mr. Canning has told us, in his usual high manner, that, the characters of princes are *public property*. Indeed, not only has this been said, in varying phrases, twenty times, during the debate; but, we constantly hear it, especially in cases of *libel*, from the Bench; and that, too, as applied to all men in high situations in the state. With reference to the latter use, which is made of this notion, one cannot refrain from observing, that that is a very odd sort of *property*, which the *proprietors* dare not touch, even so far as to ridicule it. But leaving this to remain along with the other consistencies of that curious law, let us see a little how the notion squares with the doctrine of Mr. Whitbread. The character of princes, being *public property*, ought, one would naturally suppose, to be the more carefully guarded. What is a man's own, he may do what he pleases with; but that which is the property, wholly, or in part, of another, he is bound to manage according to certain rules of equity and propriety. Mr. Whitbread, however, seems to think, that this property, which is held in trust, is to be less attended to by the actual possessor; he thinks, that, though the immoralities, though the adulterous life of the Duke of York, stands proved, and, on all hands, confessed, the House should not "throw stones" at him; that is to say, should not give him "a lecture on morality."—With respect to princes *not married*, and the temptations they may be exposed to, whatever apology may be found for their departure from the strict letter of the law, there can be none found, discovered, or invented, for their departure from the rules of *decorum*. Here passion can put in no plea. Their character, we are told, is to be specially *protected* by the *law*, because it is public property; what right have they, then, to set an example of dissoluteness of manners, injurious to the nation at large? I do not say, that they do this. Mr. Whitbread's argument is general, and so is mine. There can be no "temptation," other than the invitations of a really vicious heart, to outrage public decency. Nature, in her best form, dictates to us to draw a veil over the gratifications towards which she most strongly impels us. The manners of this country have been formed under this amiable and unerring guide; and, against those manners, he who commits an open outrage, is guilty of a very grave offence.

He discovers not only a want of moral virtue in himself; but a want of respect for it in others. He reverses the qualities of the magistrate: he is an example to evil-doers, and a terror to those who do well.—True, the situation of unmarried princes has something peculiar in it, in regard to female connections; but, if we find a hardship here, do we find nothing of peculiar advantage to weigh against it? Celibacy, in the legal sense, may be their lot; but it is also their lot to enjoy, without any exertions or cares, on their part, almost every thing which men desire in this world; besides, let us not forget, that the *law* does not impose celibacy on them. They (like all other children, 'till 21 years of age) are left, in this respect, to the will and pleasure of *their father*. It is not the *public*, nor any law, on the part of the public, that prevents them from marrying. The matter is left wholly in the Royal Family.—I can see, therefore, but very little excuse to be got out of the peculiarity of their situation, for any departure from the strict letter of the law, which excuse would not apply to every other man; while, on the other hand, I can see abundance of reasons, why an open defiance of decency should be regarded as *more* criminal in them than in other men; why the restraint should be greater, and why the temptation should be less. While they have all the means of making the least disgraceful selection of their connections, they have also all the means of rendering the connection as little scandalous as possible. They have, in this respect, many advantages, which men in general cannot possess; and if, instead of profiting from these advantages; if, instead of drawing a veil over their connexions of this sort; if, instead of keeping them in the back ground, any prince were to expose them to the public; were to intrude them upon the notice of the people; were to boast of his bastardizing deeds; were to exhibit, as it were in triumph, the pledges of prostitution; would Mr. Whitbread still say, that we should not "throw stones" at him? I will put it to Mr. Whitbread, as a husband and a father (in both which characters he is said to be eminently good), what he thinks must be the effect of such an example; and, whether he does not think, that, by the force of such an example of triumphant vice, the grey hairs of many a father would not fail to be brought with sorrow to the grave? The happiness of the people; the fidelity of husbands and wifes, the innocence of children, and

the comfort of parents; these, forming the great features of happiness, are full as much “*public property*” as are the characters of princes and men in high offices of state; nay, they are, in truth, a great deal more so; and, shall the public have no means of redress, when this inestimable property is assailed, and that, too, through the misuse of those means, which are furnished by the public themselves? Shall they, when they return from church, and from hearing “*the king’s Proclamation against Vice and Immorality*,” be drily told, that princes are under “*great temptations*”? — Of the endeavour to chip and shave and scrape and rub and polish down the charges against the Duke of York to a mere matter of crim. con., I think as Mr. Whitbread does; but, while, considering the Duke in his high public capacity, as Commander in Chief, I lose sight of this, when I am contemplating the Charges and the Evidence before the House; I cannot, when this is made a subject of separate discussion, think it a matter to be treated in the light manner, in which Mr. Whitbread attempted to treat it.

In the close of his speech, Mr. Whitbread did justice to the conduct of Mr. Wardle. In alluding to what Mr. Canning said, about a *Vote of Thanks* to that gentleman, and which vote, if brought forward, the latter declared himself ready to oppose; Mr. Whitbread observed, as the public will remember to have been the fact, that, when Mr. Wardle first brought forward his charges, the ministers, with one accord expressed their *joy*, that the imputations against the Duke had, at last, assumed a “*tangible shape*.” The COURIER news-paper, to which the public are infinitely indebted for its exertions upon this occasion, and particularly for its good plain, thumping arguments, rallied them most delightfully upon this “*tangible shape*;” but, still they appeared insensible. They thanked Mr. Wardle too. Yes, they thanked, the “*d—d good-natured friend*,” as Sir Fretful does in the play, for having told the parliament what the wicked world said of the Duke. They might, indeed, grind the word between their teeth; but they really did say, one and all, that they *thank* him. Well, now the affair is over; for a few days, at least, (for Lord Folkestone has given notice of a motion about the Duke for the 17th of April, and his lordship is not given much to joking;) Mr. Wardle’s Charges are now over; and, it seems but reasonable, since he has had so much labour, and has really

done much more than could be expected of him or of any human being, that these Thanks of the ministers should be moulded into a “*tangible shape*,” and put upon the records of parliament; and the intention, as expressed by Mr. Canning, of opposing such vote, if proposed, does appear to me to be capable of no consistent explanation; unless, indeed, the ministers are prepared to assert, that, owing to their clever mode of proceeding, the Duke owes his fall *to them*, rather than to Mr. Wardle; and, that, therefore, in voting thanks to him, they should be loading him with their own trophies. Upon any other ground, I cannot see how they can have the face to oppose such a motion. Whatever they may do, the *nation* will thank him, and will esteem and love him as one of its very best friends and greatest benefactors; as one of the few men, who, in these times of corruption, have shown themselves uncontaminated.—The *people* will thank him. They have began to thank him, some proofs of which I here insert:

“ A JUST TRIBUTE TO COL WARDLE.—As a wish has been very generally expressed by the inhabitants of this city and its neighbourhood that COLONEL G. L. WARDE, M. P. should be publicly acknowledged, for his manly and disinterested conduct in his present arduous undertaking; an opportunity will be afforded them of doing so, by subscribing an ADDRESS to that independent member of the British Parliament, of which the tenor follows:—We, hereunto subscribing, Inhabitants of the city and suburbs of Glasgow, hereby testify our unbiased and unprejudiced opinion,—“*That COLONEL WARDE, by first stepping forward, and by his conduct throughout the whole of the Investigation now pending in the honourable the House of Commons relative to his royal highness the Duke of York, has proved himself to the world, to be one of the most Magnanimous, Patriotic, Firm, and Candid Men in his Majesty’s Dominions.*”—All those who wish to mark and distinguish the conduct of this intrepid and persevering Representative of the People, and who concur in the plain and obvious sentiment contained in the above Address, will have an opportunity of joining in expressing it, by signing subscription papers, which will be opened on Thursday first,—At the shop lately possessed by Mr. Steel, Shoemaker, No. 97, Trongate;—D. Grieve’s Stocking-shop, No. 468, at the Cross;—The Se ~~ion~~-House,

head of Havannah-Street;—Both the Burgher Session-Houses, Campbell-Street;—Bridgetown Session-House;—The House of John Low, Grocer, Cross-Loan, Street, Calton;—And at the Relief Session-House, Anderston.—Glasgow, March 14th 1809.”

—The City of Canterbury has also, in the most formal manner, voted him their *thanks*, and the freedom of that City; as appears from a Letter, which I have this day received, enclosing a copy of their Resolution, in the following terms:—

“CITY OF CANTERBURY, AND COUNTY OF THE SAME CITY.—At a Court of Burghmote, holden at the Guildhall of the said City, the twenty-first day of March, 1809;—Resolved: That this Court duly considering the very laudable and patriotic conduct of G. L. WARDLE, Esq. M. P. in calling the attention of the House of Commons to the conduct of the Commander in Chief, do return him their grateful and sincere thanks; and in testimony of the high approbation this Court entertain of the able, manly, and spirited manner, in which he conducted the proceedings, that the FREEDOM of this ancient and loyal City be granted to him.—And it is ordered by this Court, that the City Seal be affixed to the above Resolution. By the Court, HAMMOND, Town-Clerk.”

—This, upon which, probably, Mr. Wardle will set as much value, as he would upon a vote of Thanks from *Mr. Canning*, is, I dare say, a mere beginning, in an official way, of giving utterance to an expression of what is felt by every impartial and independent man in the country.—

I was surprized to hear Mr. Whitbread say, that *he* was not prepared for a vote of thanks. It would be curious to hear his *reasons* for this; and I do hope, that he will have an opportunity of stating them. I am certain his objection to such vote (if, indeed, he has one) has not arisen from any little motives of personal pique, or, which would be still worse, envy: I fully acquit him of that. But, if he does oppose such a vote, I shall ascribe his opposition to those motives of *party*, which have so long been the bane of this country. The good, the very brightest gem, of this affair, is, that it has been unsullied by the smear, the ugly smear, of party. If it had been brought forward by a party, it would have failed. Mr. Sheridan did the cause, by his disclaiming it, a service never to be sufficiently praised; and, not less because it was the *faughtest* thought from his heart

to wish to render the cause such service. In *him*; in his closing acts, Mr. Wardle, and this nation, has an instance of what *party* leads to.—One would think, that those who call themselves the Opposition, must be blinded by infatuation equal to that ascribed to the Duke of York, not to see, that the nation cares not a straw for them, their motions, or their speeches; nay, that to cool the indignation of the people at any act of the ministers, the effectual way is for *them* to appear to participate in that indignation. Their blindness must surpass the blindness of moles, if it prevents their perceiving, that, into such disrepute have they fallen, that their acting in a body is sure to blast their individual exertions. Mr. Whitbread regretted that princes “wanted an *admonishing* friend;” and so do parties. The Opposition, like the Archbishop of Granada, do not seem to perceive the effects of the apoplexy; but, good Lord! is it possible, that such a man as Mr. Whitbread should not see the indifference that prevails; the total, the worse than death-like indifference, that prevails, with regard to all their motions and debates? Is there, in the whole kingdom, one town or city containing a dozen men, free from all views of gain, who would give the toss-up of a half-penny for their return to power and place? From my heart I believe there is not. The public mind has taken a new turn; the farce of *Opposition* no longer captivates, or amuses. It is a stale trick. The mockery of patriotism is not calculated any longer to impose upon a public that pays fifty millions a year in taxes. The Morning Chronicle calls this a new era in the history of the parliament; but this is only the effect of a new era in the popular view of politics and politicians; and what has been done is but a mere beginning, a mere breaking of the ice, in that salutary and constitutional *change*, which, without *destroying* (as the anti-jacobins, would fain have us believe it will) any part of the King’s just prerogatives, will be a great blessing to his people. *The dismission of the Duke of York!* I, who have taken openly, and who have inwardly felt, as much interest as any body in the proceedings, have never cared one farthing about it; that is to say, unless it was to be the forerunner of some general measure, some effectual check, some radical change of a great constitutional nature. I should hate myself if I could have written so many papers, with such a pitiful object in view. I would as lief the Duke of York

should now be at the Horse Guards as Sir David Dundas, if no effectual remedy be to follow; and, though I think Mr. Wardle entitled to the thanks of the nation, I should not be very eager to give him mine, if I thought it possible for him now to stop.

" Think nothing gain'd, he cries, 'till nought re-  
    " main,'"

must be the maxim of the man, who means now to render his country service. He must give corruption no rest, 'till he has destroyed her and the very spawn of her. And, are feats like these to be expected from a prating, pleader-like Opposition? A disciplined corps; a set of hunters after office; who like and dislike in a body? No, it never can be and never will be; and of this the country is as well assured, as I am of this pen's being in my hand.—Mr. Whitbread seems satisfied; I am not, and never shall be, as long as I see an Apothecary General, *who meddles with no business whatever*; who rides in his coach and four, deriving 12,000 pounds a year out of the taxes, and who (oh! inde-  
lible shame!) pockets ten shillings a day, *as an officer upon the staff*, and who declares this, at the same time that he declares that he *never meddles with any business*. This is upon record, in a Report before the House of Commons; no measure has been taken upon it; and, while this is the case, I am not satisfied, nor can I be satisfied. To those who merit pensions for *real services to the public*, or for *real losses sustained for the sake of the public or the king*, I grudge nothing. But, I do grudge every single farthing that goes in the way above described, or in any such manner; and if it was not that I hope to contribute towards the overthrow of such abuses, I never would write another line as long as I live.

*Botley, Thursday, 23rd March, 1809.*

#### SUBSCRIPTION FOR MISS TAYLOR.

This Undertaking promises very fair for success. The Public have felt and acted, upon the occasion, as I expected they would. The names of Subscribers, as they come, are inserted, in THE TIMES, MORNING CHRONICLE, COURIER, STATESMAN, and other news-papers, through the liberality of the proprietors, whose conduct merits great applause. When the Subscription is closed, I intend to publish the List complete in the Register; and, if any Lady or Gentleman should see their name

omitted in the papers now, I shall be glad to have the error corrected.—Mr. TIMOTHY BROWN, who has lent so much assistance to us, was so good as to send me, yesterday, an extract of a letter from a friend of his, who, in consequence of the base insinuations, against this young woman, published, last week, in the Morning Post news-paper, took the trouble to make, in person, particular inquiries, at Chelsea, which extract, from motives similar to those, from which the inquiry was made, I here insert.—“With respect to Miss Taylor, I “felt myself called upon to inform myself “whether I was advocating the cause of “a deserving unprotected female, or sup- “porting a worthless woman. With this “view, I proceeded to Chelsea, and, after “the most rigid scrutiny into her history, “character, and connections, among her “neighbours, I could find nothing against “her but her poverty. The very circum- “stance of her endeavouring to obtain an “honest and reputable livelihood, by “keeping a school, is an argument of a “virtuous disposition. Her scholars having “been withdrawn by their parents the in- “stant it appeared she was a relation of Mrs. “Clarke, is a proof that her scholars were “respectable; and her merit will appear “the greater when it is recollected, the “temptations held out to her by the “blandishments of prostitution were more “than sufficient to warp her from the “line of right, if her mind had not “been well fenced with good principles. “She had it also in her power to have “corrected the errors of fortune by taking “up the business of an Army Broker. “Her credit with her relation, Mrs. “Clarke, might well have induced her to “have recourse to such ways and means, “if she had been disposed to engage in “such dishonorable traffic; but it no “where appears that she ever mixed her- “self with such concerns, or that she “neglected the most sacred trust, with “which she had charged herself, to par- “take of the revelries at Glo'ster Place. “My enquiries were rigid: I asked this “question, whether male visitors frequent- “ed her house; or any of her scholars “accompanied her to Mrs. Clarke's? To “these important questions I received a “direct negative. These facts I will beg “you to communicate to your friends.”

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The several communications that have recently been made to me, I shall, the writers may be assured, not fail to make

use of, in that way, which will, doubtless, be most likely to further the views of the several writers.

#### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

**PRUSSIA.**—*Letter of the King to the Magistrates of Berlin.*—24 Dec. 1808.

WORTHY, beloved, and faithful subjects, my provinces being evacuated by the French, my attention is now directed to the accomplishment of my heartfelt wish of returning to my capital of Berlin, with the queen my spouse, and my family—an object which I have by all possible means endeavoured to attain since the conclusion of peace. I have given orders that the constituted authorities shall leave this place for Berlin, as soon as the districts on the other side of the Vistula have begun to breathe a little from the effect of the heavy burthens they have sustained in furnishing carriages and supplies, both before and during the evacuation of the country. This short interval I shall employ in a journey to St. Petersburgh, in consequence of the repeated friendly and urgent invitations, both verbally and by letter, of his majesty the emperor of Russia. I shall expedite my journey, and hope, within a few weeks, to revisit my provinces on the other side of the Visula, to which I owe so many proofs of exemplary fidelity; and I shall in particular hasten my return to Berlin, to testify to my subjects of that city my gratitude for their firmness and good conduct, and to assure them of my attachment and satisfaction. I inform you hereof, and command you to notify the same to my loving and faithful citizens of that city; and I am your loving sovereign

FREDERICK WILLIAM.

**SPANISH REVOLUTION.**—*Twenty-ninth Bulletin of the French Army of Spain, dated Valladolid, Jan. 16, 1809.*

“ On the 10th Jan. the head-quarters of general the duke of Bellune were at Aranjuez.—Here he learned that the remains of the army, which had been beaten at Tudela, were re-united in the neighbourhood of Cuenca, after having been joined by the new levies from Granada, Valencia and Murcia. The king of Spain conceived the possibility of drawing out the enemy. With this view, he ordered all the posts to fall back, which had advanced to the mountains of Cuenca, beyond Tarancón and Huete. The Spanish army followed this movement. On the 12th, it was stationed at Vélez. The duke of Bellune then took post at Tarancón and Fuente de

Pedronara. On the 15th, the division of Villatte marched directly against the enemy; while the duke of Bellune, with the division of Russin, took a circuit by Alcazar. As soon as general Villatte discovered the Spaniards, he advanced to the charge, and put to the rout the enemy's 12 or 13,000 men, who immediately endeavoured to retire by Cara-cosa on Alcazar. The 9th reg. of light infantry, the 24th, and the 96th of the line, presented to the enemy a wall of bayonets. The Spaniards threw down their arms. 300 officers, two generals, seven colonels, 20 lieutenant-colonels, and 12,000 men, were made prisoners. Thirty standards, and all the artillery, have been taken. One Venegos, who commanded these troops, has been killed. The whole of the captured army, with its colours, escorted by three battalions, will, to-morrow, (the 17th), make its entrance into Madrid.—This success does the greatest honour to the duke of Bellune, and to the conduct of his troops. General Villatte manœuvred with skill, and general Russin distinguished himself: so did general Latour Mauburg. The young Sopransi, chef d'escadron of the 1st dragoons, threw himself into the midst of the enemy, displaying a singular bravery. He brought six stand of colours to the duke of Bellune. — The general of artillery Senarmont conducted himself as he has always done: when the enemy's army found its retreat was cut off, it changed its direction. General Senarmont then occupied a narrow pass with his artillery, and upon this pass it was that the enemy directed his course, in order to find out an opening. The artillery had little escort; but the cannoneers of the grand army had no need of it. General Senarmont placed his guns in square battalion, and fired with grape shot. The enemy's column again changed its direction, and turned to the quarter from whence it came, to lay down its arms.—The duke of Bellune praises M. Chateau, his first aide-de-camp. He recommends also general Semelle, and colonels Jaimini, Meunier, Mouton, &c. officers whose bravery and skill have been tried in a thousand actions.—In Galicia the English still continue to be pursued at the point of the sword. After having been chased from Lugo, three parts of them took the direction to Corunna, the fourth that to Vigo, where they have transports. The duke of Dalmatia has advanced towards Corunna, and the duke of Elchingen to Vigo.—Deputations of the Council of State of Spain,

of the Council of the Indies, of the Council of Finances, of the Council of War, of the Council of Marine, of the Council of Orders, of the Junta of Commerce and of Money, of the Tribunals of Alcaldes, of the Municipality of Madrid, of the Clergy regular and secular, of the Order of Nobility, of the Corporation, major and minor, of the inhabitants and parishes of the different quarters of Madrid, were presented to the Emperor and King on the 16th, at Valladolid.—The following Addresses have been presented to his Majesty :

Address of M. le Count de Montarco, in the name of the Council of State.—Sire, The Council of State is happy in having the honour of being presented to your majesty the Emperor and King, in order to return you its homage of thanks for the generous clemency which you have deigned to manifest towards the supreme Council of the monarchy. What gratitude does it not owe you for having snatched Spain from the influence of those destructive councils which fifty years of misfortunes had prepared for it—for having rid it of the English armies, which threatened to fix upon its territories the theatre of continental war, and to inflict upon it the disorders and the ravages which are usually in its train! Grateful for all these benefits, the Council of State has still another supplication to lay at the feet of your Majesty. Deign, Sire, to commit to our loyalty your august Brother, our lord and king. Permit him to re-enter Madrid, and to take into his hands the reins of government; so that under the benevolent sway of this august prince, whose mildness, wisdom, and justice, are known to all Europe, our widowed and desolate Monarchy may find a father in the best of kings. Sire, we have sworn to obey him; we have offered him the homage of our fidelity: we will keep our oath: and your Majesty shall have no cause to regret, either the confidence you shall deign to repose in us, or the clemency which you have exercised towards us.'

Address of Don Bernardo Iriarte, in the name of the Council of the Indies.—‘Sire; The Council of the Indies has the honour to present itself to your majesty the Emperor and King, in order to offer to you the homage of its profound respect, in beseeching you to grant it your sovereign protection. It entirely submits itself to the decrees of your Majesty, and to those of your august Brother the King our Master, who is to create the happiness of Spain, as well

by the wisdom and the assemblage of the lofty virtues which he possesses, as by the powerful support of the Hero of Europe, upon whom the Council of the Indies finds the hope which it has of seeing re-united those ties which ought always to unite the American possessions with the Mother Country.’

Address of D. Manuel de Valanzuela, in the name of the Council of Finances.—‘Sire; The Council of Finances has the honour to offer to your Imperial and Royal Majesty the homage of its profound respect. Uniting its intreaties to those of the city of Madrid, it implores your Imperial and Royal Majesty, that you will be graciously pleased to confer upon it the favour to permit it to behold in Madrid the august and beloved Brother of your Majesty. The Council expects from this favour the felicity and repose of the kingdom, which is its sweetest hope.’

Speech of the Marquis de las Amarillas in the name of the Council of War.—‘Sire; The Supreme Council of War has received with the most lively gratitude the honour which it had solicited of laying at the feet of your Imperial and Royal Majesty its respectful homage, and most humble thanks, for the clemency which your Majesty has displayed towards the city of Madrid.—It unites its supplications to those of the Representatives of Madrid, that your Majesty, through an effect of your august beneficence, will confer upon this capital and its district the felicity of granting them the presence of their King, Joseph the 1st, in order that his government may confer upon us the tranquillity and the advantages which we expect from it, and of which the Spanish nation has so urgent a want under the actual circumstances.’

Speech of the Lieutenant-general of Marine, D. Joseph Justo de Salcedo, in the name of the Council of Marine.—‘Sire; The Council of Marine has the honour of presenting to your Imperial and Royal Majesty the homage of its profound respect. It unites its intreaties with those of the Council of State, and others which have preceded it, imploring your Majesty, that for the welfare of the country you will be pleased to confer upon it the favour that your august Brother may reign in Spain for the repose and tranquillity of all the kingdom. The Council desires that the zeal of the body of the Marine, and its labours for the service of the country, may, under the influence of such wise laws, contribute to the liberty of the seas,

and to draw more close the ancient and legitimate bond which unite the two worlds.'

Speech of D. Pirerra, in the name of the Tribunal of Alcaldes de Casa y Corte of Madrid.—'Sire; The Alcaldes of the Imperial Household and Metropolis have the honour to present to your Imperial and Royal Majesty, the respect and homage of their Tribunal. They are ordered to present to you the most humble thanks, for the clemency with which your Majesty, the conqueror of Madrid, has been pleased to treat this city, and implore you to forget its errors; that your Majesty will be pleased to receive the assurance of the fidelity with which this city will obey your august Brother, a promise of which all the inhabitants are hostages; and that your Majesty will be pleased to grant their earnest entreaties, that his Royal Majesty may honour them with his presence, and take the reins of government. The Tribunal will omit nothing which depends upon itself, in order to confirm the people in the sentiments with which they are animated, purging them from the evil-minded who tried to seduce them, and will consider it as a great felicity to be furnished with the means of shewing their attachment to your august person, and that of the beneficent Sovereign, whom it hopes to receive at your hand.'

The Speech of D. Juan Masanillo, Corregidor of Madrid, in the name of the City of Madrid, of the Body of Nobility, of the Ecclesiastical Body, of the five Corporations, &c. &c.—'Sire; The whole city of Madrid has repaired to the churches. Its first sentiment was that of thanking Heaven for the clemency which your Majesty evinced towards the capital, and through which we have escaped the calamities which threatened us. Its second sentiment has been that of fidelity and obedience towards its king Joseph. We have the honour of presenting to-day to your Imperial and Royal Majesty, the register which contains 27,500 signatures by fathers of families, and by all the heads of houses established in the capital. The city of Madrid will be faithful to its king. It has charged us to lay this assurance at the feet of your Majesty, and to promise in its name that its sentiments will never change. A prince who unites all the great qualities which distinguish our king, who, by his alliance with your Majesty, assures us a perpetual peace upon the continent, who is endowed with every generous sentiment, and with all the princi-

ples of a good administration, can alone assure the felicity of Spain, and re-establish the prosperity of the state. The whole city of Madrid implores you, Sir, to entrust to it the person of the King. The felicity of Spain will not commence again, until he shall be restored to the wishes of his subjects. It will be only from the date of this day, that Spain will enjoy the hope of being for ever sheltered from the calamities which factions, civil dissensions, and bad citizens, draw after them.'

"King Joseph will make his entry into Madrid the 18th or 19th of this month.—Relays have been sent on the road towards Bayonne. It is believed that the Imperial head-quarters will instantly be set in motion."

#### *Thirtieth Bulletin, dated Valladolid, Jan. 21.*

The duke of Dalmatia left Betanzos on the 12th inst. Having reached the Mero, he found the bridge of Burgo cut. The enemy was dislodged from the village of Burgo. In the mean while general Franceschi ascended the river, which he crossed at the bridge of Sela. He made himself master of the high road from Corunna to Santiago, and took six officers and 60 soldiers prisoners. On the same day a body of 30 marines, who were fetching water from the bay near Mero, were taken. From the village of Perillo, the English fleet could be observed in the harbour of Corunna.—On the 13th, the enemy caused two powder magazines, situated near the heights of St. Margaret, at half a league from Corunna, to be blown up. The explosion was terrible, and was felt at the distance of three leagues.—On the 14th, the bridge at Burgo was repaired, and the French artillery was able to pass. The enemy had taken a position at two leagues distance, half a league before Corunna. He was seen employed in hastily embarking his sick and wounded, the numbers of whom, according to spies and deserters, amounted to 3000 or 4000 men. The English were in the mean while occupied in destroying the batteries on the coast, and laying waste the country on the sea shore. The commandant of the fort of St. Philip, suspecting the fate intended for his fortification, refused to admit them in it.—On the evening of the 14th we saw a fresh convoy of 160 sail arrive, among which were four ships of the line.—On the morning of the 15th, the divisions Merle and Mermet occupied the heights of Villaboa.

where the enemy's advanced guard was stationed, which was attacked and destroyed. Our right wing was stationed on the point where the road from Corunna to Lugo, and that from Corunna to Santiago meet. The left was placed behind the village of Elvina. The enemy was stationed behind some beautiful heights.—The rest of the 15th was spent in fixing a battery of 12 pieces of cannon; and it was not till the 16th, at three o'clock in the afternoon, that the duke of Dalmatia gave orders to attack.—The assault was made upon the English by the first brigade of the division Mermet, which overthrew them, and drove them from the village of Elvina. The second regiment of light infantry covered itself with glory. General Jardon, at the head of the Voltigeurs, wrought a terrible carnage. The enemy, driven from his positions, retreated to the gardens which surround Corunna.—The night growing very dark, it was necessary to suspend the attack. The enemy availed himself of this to embark with precipitation. Only 3000 of our men were engaged, and every arrangement was made for abandoning the positions of the night, and advancing next day to a general attack. The loss of the enemy has been immense. Two of our batteries played upon them during the whole of the engagement. We counted on the field of battle more than eight hundred of their dead bodies; among which was the body of general Hamilton, and those of two other general officers, whose names we are unacquainted with. We have taken 20 officers, 300 men, and 4 pieces of cannon. The English have left behind them more than 1500 horses, which they had killed. Our loss amounts to 100 killed, and 150 wounded.—The colonel of the 47th regiment distinguished himself.—An ensign of the 31st infantry killed with his own hand an English officer, who had endeavoured to wrest from him his eagle. The general of artillery Bomgeat and col. Fontenay have signalized themselves. At day-break on the 17th, we saw the English convoy under sail. On the 18th, the whole had disappeared. The duke of Dalmatia had caused a caronade to be discharged upon the vessels from the fort of Santiago. Several transports ran aground, and all the men who were on board were taken. We found in the establishment of the Palloza (a large manufactory, &c. in the suburbs of Corunna, where the English had previously been encamped) 3000 English muskets. Magazines also were seized, containing a great

quantity of ammunition and other effects, belonging to the hostile army. A great number of wounded were picked up in the suburbs. The opinion of the inhabitants on the spot, and deserters, is, that the number of wounded in the battle exceeds 2500 men. Thus has terminated the English expedition which was sent into Spain. After having fomented the war in this unhappy country, the English have abandoned it. They had disembarked 38,000 men and 6000 horses. We have taken from them, according to calculation, 6,500 men, exclusive of the sick. They have reembarked very little baggage, very little ammunition, and very few horses. We have counted 5,000 killed and left behind. The men who have found an asylum on board their vessels are harassed and dejected. In another season of the year not one of them would have escaped. The facility of cutting the bridges, the rapidity of the torrents, which in winter swell to deep rivers, the shortness of the days, and the length of the nights, are very favourable to an army on their retreat. Of the 38,000 men whom the English had disembarked, we may be assured that scarcely 24,000 will return to England. The army of Romana, which at the end of December by the aid of reinforcements which it had received from Gallicia, consisted of 16,000 men, is reduced to less than 5000 men, who are wandering between Vigo and Santiago, and are closely pursued. The kingdom of Leon, the province of Zamora, and all Gallicia, which the English had been desirous to cover, are conquered and subdued. The general of division Lapisse has sent patroles into Portugal, who have been well received there. General Maupetit has entered Salamanca; he met there with some sick of the English troops.

*Intercepted Letter.—St. Jago, Jan. 6. 1809.*

“ I suppose, my dear friend, you are already acquainted with my arrival at this place; I have been here these eight days, with a detachment composed of troops from seven different regiments.—We are guarding the magazines that are here; and I hoped to continue at St. Jago for some months, which would have given me great pleasure. As I am a person of some consequence, I am never addressed but as a Seignor, the Commander of the English troops; I am well lodged, and have an agreeable society about me, all which comforts I shall be very sorry to quit. The French are the most uncivil people

in the world. I think they have very little to eat or drink themselves, and, therefore, they have nothing to do but to annoy us poor fellows, when we are just sitting down to a good repast.—Last night I was called up by a Spanish dragoon, who brought letters from Corunna, informing me that a part of our army would soon reach St. Jago, and that I must hold myself in readiness to march along with it upon Vigo. I could not close my eyes the whole night, for thinking at every instant that our troops were arrived; but till the present moment not one man has made his appearance; and I begin now to think that the whole has been a dull joke. As you are nearer the theatre of war than myself you will oblige me by giving me a true account of the present state of affairs. If there is reason to think that we are going to re-embark, and to be, as it were, hunted out of the kingdom, without ever coming to blows, a pretty figure we shall make of it! I think I already hear Cobbett's sarcasms upon us, who will not fail to represent us as the *heroes* of Spain, cooped up in their own transports. (Signed) L. E. THURN."

#### *Thirty-first Bulletin.*

The English regiments bearing the numbers 42, 50, and 52, have been entirely destroyed in the battle of the 16th, near Corunna. Not 60 men of each of these corps embarked. The general in chief, Moore, has been killed in attempting to charge at the head of this brigade, with the view of restoring the fortune of the day. Fruitless efforts! This troop was dispersed, and its general slain in the midst of it. General Baird had been already wounded. He passed through Corunna to get on board his ship, and did not get his wound dressed till he got on board; it is reported that he died on the 19th. After the battle of the 16th, a dreadful night passed at Corunna.—The English entered in confusion and consternation. The English army had landed more than 80 pieces of cannon; only 12 were re-embarked: the remainder has been taken or lost; and by a return made, we find ourselves in possession of 60 pieces of English cannon. Independent of two millions of treasure the army has taken from the English, it appears that a treasure more considerable has been cast away among the rocks and precipices which border the road from Astorga to Corunna. The peasants and the soldiers have collected a great quantity of silver among the rocks.

In the engagements which took place during the retreat, and prior to the battle of Corunna, two English generals were killed, and three wounded. General Crawford is named among the last. The English have lost every thing that constitutes an army—generals, artillery, horses, baggage, ammunition, magazines. On the 17th, at day-break, we were masters of the heights that command the road to Corunna, and the batteries were playing upon the English convoy. The result was, that many of the ships were unable to get out, and were taken at the capitulation of Corunna. Five hundred horses were also taken still alive, 16,000 muskets, and a great deal of battering cannon abandoned by the enemy. A great number of magazines are full of preserved provisions (munition confectionnes), which the English wished to carry off, but were obliged to leave behind. A powder magazine, containing 200,000lbs. weight of powder, has also fallen into our hands. The English, surprised by the issue of the battle of the 16th, have not even had time to destroy their magazines. There were even 300 English sick in the hospital. We found in the port seven English ships—three were loaded with horses, and four with troops. They could not get out. The fortress of Corunna is of an extent which secures it from a coup de main. It was therefore impossible to enter it before the 20th, in virtue of the annexed capitulation. In Corunna we found above 200 pieces of Spanish cannon. The French Consul Fourcroy, the general Quesnel, and his staff; M. Bougars, officer of ordnance; M. Taboureau, auditor; and 350 French soldiers or seamen, who had been made prisoners either in Portugal or on board the ship Atlas, have been delivered up. They express great satisfaction at the conduct of the officers of the Spanish navy. The English will have gained by their expedition the hatred of the Spaniards, shame, and dishonour. The flower of their army, composed of Scotchmen, has been either wounded, killed, or taken. General Franceschi has entered St. Jago de Compostella, where he found some magazines and an English guard, which he took. He marched immediately upon Vigo. Romana appeared to have taken this route with 2500 men, all that he could rally. The division of Mermet marched on Ferrol. The air about Corunna is infected by the carcasses of 1200 horses whom the English killed in the streets. The first care of the duke of Dalmatia has been to provide for the restoration of salubrity, equally important to

the soldiers and the inhabitants. General Alzedo, governor of Corunna, appears to have taken part with the insurgents only from the constraint of force. He took the oath of fidelity to king Joseph Napoleon with enthusiasm. The people manifest the joy they feel at being delivered from the English.

*Convention between his excellency the Marshal Duke of Dalmatia, and Commander in Chief of the Troops of his Maj' ty the Emperor and King in Gallicia, and General Don Antonio Alzedo, Military and Civil Governor at Corunna.*

Art. 1. The place of Corunna, the fortified works, the batteries and ports which depend on it, artillery, ammunition, magazines, charts, plans, and memoirs, shall be given up to the troops of his majesty the emperor and king, Napoleon. For this purpose his excellency the marshal duke of Dalmatia shall be at liberty to take possession of the gate called the Lower Tower (*la tour d'en bas,*) this evening.—2. The Spanish garrison which is in Corunna; the persons in civil authority, as well judicial as administrative or financial; the clergy, and the inhabitants in general, shall take the oath of fidelity and homage to his majesty the king of Spain and the Indies, Don Joseph Napoleon.—3. The persons concerned in the civil administration, as well judicial as financial; the intendant general of the kingdom of Gallicia and of the province of Corunna, the Corregidores, Alcaldes, and other functionaries, shall be provisionally preserved in their employments, and shall exercise their functions in the name of his majesty king Joseph Napoleon. All the acts of the civil administration shall be made in the name of his said majesty.—4. The military of the garrison, whatever be their rank and employment, may enter into the service of his majesty, king Joseph Napoleon, and be allowed to retain the same rank, after having taken the customary oaths of fidelity and allegiance, as is provided in the second Article.—For this purpose a list of the names of the principal and inferior officers and soldiers shall be made out.—This list shall be certified by his excellency general Don Antonio D'Alzedo, governor of Corunna, to the end that a particular destination may be given to the military, according to the orders of his excellency the minister of war in the kingdom of Spain; but in the mean time the military shall wait at Corunna. The means of subsistence and quarters shall be

furnished to them as to the French troops. The officers, and those employed in the royal marine, who are at Corunna, are included in the present Article, and must await at Corunna the orders of the minister of Marine.—5. The Military of the garrison, whatever their rank, who wish to quit the service, shall be at liberty to retire to their respective habitations, after they shall have received their dismissal in due form, under the authority of his excellency the minister at war; and on taking the oath of fidelity described in the second Article.—Such as refuse to take such oath shall be considered prisoners of war.—6. The property of the inhabitants shall be respected, and no contribution shall be levied on them, but a subsistence for the troops in garrison shall be provided by the province. That the places of public worship, and the government, shall be placed under safe custody; religion shall be respected, and its ministers shall be protected in the exercise of their functions.—7. The administration of the royal revenues shall be continued as heretofore, but in the name of, and to the use of his majesty king Joseph Napoleon; and to that effect, all the ecclesiastical and civil authorities, as well as those employed for the king, shall continue to fulfil their respective functions, and shall be paid according to their several appointments.—8. If any one employed in the courts, or in the administration, shall be desirous of resigning his office, his resignation shall be accepted, and no one shall prevent such measure; and if he should desire to leave the town with his effects and property, he shall be permitted so to do, granting him proper sureties, and a passport for that purpose.—9. The deputies of towns, and all other individuals, called to form a part of the Junta of the kingdom of Gallicia, may return to their houses, with their equipages and their property, if they shall so wish; and an escort shall be granted to them for their personal security, on their requiring it.—10. Every inhabitant of the place shall be at liberty to retire whithersoever he pleases, with his moveables, effects, and whatever belongs to him, provided the place of his retirement be in the interior of the kingdom.—11. The houses and effects of all persons who may be absent by order, or leave, business, or any other cause, shall be respected, and the proprietors shall be at liberty to return when they find it convenient.—12. The benefit of a general amnesty, granted by the emperor and king

in his own name as well as in the name of his majesty king Joseph Napoleon, shall be extended to the garrison and the inhabitants of Corunna, as also to persons who have filled official situations. For this purpose no individual shall be prosecuted, arrested, or punished, for any share they may have had in the disturbances which have agitated the kingdom, nor for their speeches, writings or actions, the measures, resolutions, or orders, which have been adopted or executed during the commotions.—The benefit of the same general amnesty shall be extended to all the towns, villages, and communes of the kingdom of Gallicia, as soon as they shall have submitted, and as soon as the inhabitants shall have taken the oath of fidelity to his majesty the king Joseph Napoleon.—13. The laws, customs, and dress of the people shall be preserved without any infringement, or modification; the laws shall be those which are, or shall be established by the constitution of the kingdom.—Done at Corunna, the 19th day of Jan. 1809.

(Signed) Marshal the Duke of DALMATIA.  
ANTONIO DE ALZEDO.

---

*Thirty-second Bulletin.*

The duke of Dalmatia, being arrived before Ferrol, caused the place to be invested. Negotiations were begun. The civil authorities, and the military and naval officers, manifested a disposition to surrender; but the people, fomented by the spies whom the English had left, resisted. On the 24th, the duke of Dalmatia received two messengers, one sent by admiral Melgarejo, commander of the Spanish squadron, and the other, who came across the mountains, sent by the military commanders. These couriers were both sent without the knowledge of the people. They stated that the authorities were under the yoke of a furious populace, excited and paid by the agents of England, and that 8000 men belonging to the city and its environs were in arms.—The duke of Dalmatia had to resolve upon opening the trenches; but from the 24th to the 25th various movements were manifest in the town. The 17th regiment of light infantry had repaired to Murgardos; the 31st regiment of light infantry were at the forts of La Palma and St. Martin, and at Lagrana; and as they blockaded the fort St. Philip, the people began to fear the consequences of an assault, and to listen to men of sense. On the 26th, three flags of truce, furnished with authority, and the annexed letter, arrived at the head quar-

ters, and signed the surrender of the place. On the 27th, at seven o'clock in the morning, the town was occupied by the division Mermet, and by a brigade of dragoons. On the same day the garrison was disarmed; the disarming also produced 5000 musquets. The people who do not belong to Ferrol, have been remanded to their villages. The men who had stained themselves with blood during the insurrection, have been arrested. Admiral Obregon, whom the people had arrested during the insurrection, has been put at the head of the arsenal. There have been found in the port three vessels of 112 guns, two of 88, one of 74, two of 64, three frigates, and a considerable number of corvettes, brigs, and unarmed vessels, more than 1500 pieces of cannon of every size, and ammunition of all kinds.—It is probable that, but for the precipitate retreat of the English, and the affair of the 16th, they would have occupied Ferrol, and seized this beautiful squadron. The military and naval officers have taken the oath to king Joseph with the greatest enthusiasm. What they relate of their sufferings from the lowest classes of the people and the English, is inconceivable. Order reigns in Gallicia, and the authority of the king is re-established in this province, one of the most considerable of the Spanish Monarchy.—General Laborde has found at Corunna, on the sea shore, seven pieces of cannon, which the English had buried on the 16th, not being able to take them away. La Romana, abandoned by the English and his own troops, has fled with 500 men, in order to throw himself into Andalusia. There remained at Lisbon only about 4 or 5000 Englishmen. All the hospitals and all the magazines were embarked, and the garrison were preparing to abandon this nation, as indignant at the perfidy of the English, as they are disgusted by the difference of manners and religion, by the continual and brutal intemperance of the English troops, and that arrogance and ill founded pride which renders this nation odious to the Continent.

---

*Thirty-third Bulletin, dated Paris, March 9.*

“ The duke of Dalmatia arrived at Tuy on the 10th February. The whole province is subdued.—He collected all his forces in order to cross the Minho on the following day. He was to reach Oporto between the 15th and 20th, and Lisbon between the 20th and 28th.—The English have embarked at Lisbon, in order to abandon Portugal. The rage of the Portuguese

was at its utmost height, and every day considerable and bloody conflicts between the Portuguese and English took place. In Galicia the duke of Elchingen had completed the organization of the province. Admiral Massaredo is arrived at Ferrol, and has begun to revive the labours of that important arsenal.—Peace is restored in all the provinces under the command of the duke of Istria, which lie between the Pyrenees, the sea, Portugal, and the chain of mountains which cover Madrid. Security follows days of disorder and desolation.—Daily deputations repair on all sides to the King, at Madrid. Re-organisation and public spirit are quickly springing up under the new administration.—The duke of Belluno has marched to Badajoz; he has restored to peace and disarmed the whole of Lower Estremadura.—Saragossa has surrendered; the calamities which have befallen this unhappy town, are a terrifying example to the people. The peace which has been restored in Saragossa extends to the whole of Arragon, and the two armies, which were around the town, have been set at liberty. Saragossa was the centre of the insurrection of Spain; it was in this town that the party was formed which wished to call in a prince of the House of Austria to reign on the Tagus. The individuals of this party had partly inherited these notions, which are irreversibly destroyed, from their ancestors, during the war of the Succession.—The battle of Tudela was won on the 23rd of November, and after the 27th, the French army was encamped at a small distance from Saragossa. The people of this town were armed. The peasants of Arragon had repaired thither, and Saragossa contained 50,000 men, formed into regiments of 1000 men, and companies of 100. The general officers and subalterns consisted of monks. A body of 10,000 men, who had escaped from Tudela, had thrown themselves into the town, which was furnished with provisions, heaped up in innumerable magazines, and defended by 200 pieces of cannon. The image of Our Lady of Pilar wrought miracles at the head of the monks, who, by such means, animated the zeal, and preserved the confidence of the multitude. In the field these 50,000 men would not have withstood three regiments, but shut up in their town, and wrought upon by the leaders of parties, how could they escape the miseries which ignorance and fanaticism heap upon the heads of so many wretches?—Every thing possible was done to enlighten them, and bring them to reason. Im-

mediately after the battle of Tudela, the belief entertained at Saragossa, that Madrid held out, and that they might be relieved; and that the armies at Somosierra, Guadarama, Estremadura, Leon, and Catalonia, might furnish a pretext for the chiefs of the insurgents to keep alive the fanaticism of the inhabitants; it was resolved not to surround the town, but to permit it to maintain a communication with all Spain, in order that they might be informed of the annihilation of the Spanish armies, and of the circumstances which attended the entrance of the French army into Madrid; but all this intelligence came to the ears of the ringleaders alone, and was unknown by the body of the people. The truth was not only concealed from them, but their courage was kept up by lies. At one time, the French had lost 40,000 men before Madrid, at another time, Romana had entered France, and the French eagles were compelled to fly before the terrible leopard. This period sacrificed to political objects, in order to allow a multitude to come to reason, who were infatuated by fanaticism, and a terror inspired by their enraged leaders, was not lost to the French army.—The general of engineers, Lacoste, aid de-camp of the emperor, and an officer of the greatest merit, collected at Alagon the materials and instruments for mining, in order to carry on the subterraneous war, which the emperor had commanded.—The general of division, Dedon, who commanded the artillery, collected a great quantity of mortars, bombs, and howitzers of every calibre. All these were brought from Pamplona, seven days march from Saragossa. In the mean time it was observed, that the enemy had availed himself of this delay in order to fortify Monte Torrero, and other strong positions. On the 20th of December the division of Suchet drove him from the heights of St. Lambert, and from two outworks which were within reach of the town. The division of general Gazan drove the enemy from the heights of St. Gregorio, and with the 21st regiment of light infantry, and the 109th regiment of the line, took the redoubts which were thrown up in the suburbs, and defended the roads of Sueva and Barcelona. He also made himself master of a great laboratory near Galliego, in which 500 Swiss had entrenched themselves. On the same day, the duke of Cornegliano made himself master of the works and positions of Monte Torrero; he took all the cannon, made a great number of prisoners, and did great injury to

the enemy.—The duke of Cornegliano being sick, the duke of Abrantes came at the beginning of January, and took the command of the third division. He signalized his arrival by taking the monastery of St. Joseph, and pursued his advantages on the 16th of Jan. by taking the bridge of La Hueba, where his troops fixed themselves. The chief of battalion Stahl, of the 14th regiment of the line, distinguished himself in the attack on the monastery of St. Joseph, and the lieut. Victor D. Button was the first in the assault.—The circumvention of Saragossa was not yet resolved upon; that was considered as inexpedient; and a free communication was still left open, in order that the insurgents might be informed of the defeat of the English, and their infamous flight out of Spain. It was on the 16th of Jan. that the English were driven into the sea at Corunna, and it was on the 26th that the operations before Saragossa were seriously begun. The duke of Montebello arrived there on the 20th, in order to assume the command of the siege. As soon as he was assured that the intelligence which was brought into the town had no effect, and that a few monks governed the minds of the people, he resolved to put an end to these indulgences; 50,000 peasants were collected on the left banks of the Ebro: at Pardiguera the duke of Treviso attacked them with three regiments; and, notwithstanding the fine position they possessed, the 64th regiment routed them, and threw them into disorder. The 10th regiment of hussars was on the plain to receive them, and a great number remained upon the field of battle. Nine pieces of cannon and several standards were the trophies of this victory.—At the same time, the duke of Montebello had sent the adjutant-commandant, Gosquet, to Zucra, in order to disperse an assemblage of insurgents; this officer attacked 4000 of them with three battalions, overthrew them, and took four pieces of cannon, with their carriages and horses. Gen. Vattier was at the same time sent with 300 infantry, and 200 cavalry, towards Valencia. He met 5000 insurgents at Alcanitz, compelled them, even in the town, to throw down their arms in their flight; he killed 600 men, and seized magazines, provisions, and arms; among the last were 100 English muskets. The adjutant-commandant, Carrion Nizos, conducted himself gloriously at the head of a column of infantry. Col. Burthe, of the 4th regiment of hussars, and the chief of battalion,

Camus, of the 28th regiment of light infantry, distinguished themselves. These operations took place between the 20th and 26th of January.—On the 26th the town was seriously attacked, and the batteries were unmasks, and at noon, on the 27th, the breach was practicable in several places; the troops were lodged in the monastery of San-in-Gracia. The division of Grandjean entered some thirty houses. The col. Caloiscki and the soldiers of the Weixel, distinguished themselves. At the same moment, the general of division, Morlat, in an attack upon the left wing, made himself master of the whole fore-ground of the enemy's defence. Captain Guttemar, at the head of the pioneers, and thirty-six grenadiers of the 14th regiment, laid, with a rare intrepidity, ascended the breach. M. Babieski, an officer of the Voltigeurs of the Weixel, a young man seventeen years of age, and covered with seven wounds, was the first who appeared upon the breach. The chief of battalion, Lejune, aide-de-camp to the prince of Neufchatel, distinguished himself and received two slight wounds. The chief of battalion, Ilaxo, is also slightly wounded, and likewise distinguished himself.—On the 30th, the monasteries of the Monique and Greek Augustines were occupied. Sixty houses were possessed by undermining. The miners of the 14th regiment distinguished themselves.—On the 1st of Feb. general Lacoste received a ball, and died in the field of honour. He was a brave and distinguished officer. He has been lamented by the whole army, but more especially by the Emperor. Colonel Regniat succeeded him in the command of the engineers, and in the management of the siege. The enemy defended every house. Three attacks were made by mines, and every day several houses were blown up, and afforded the troops an opportunity of stationing themselves in other houses.—Thus we proceeded to the Cossa (a great street in Saragossa) where we made ourselves masters of the buildings of the public school and university. The enemy endeavoured to oppose miners to miners; but less used to this sort of operation, their miners were every day discovered and suffocated. This mode of besieging rendered our progress slow, but sure, and less destructive to the army. While three companies of miners and eight companies of sappers carried on this subterraneous war, the consequences of which were so dreadful, the fire on the towu was kept up by mortars. Ten days

after the attack had begun, the surrender of the town was anticipated. The army had possessed itself of one third of the houses, and fortified itself in them. The church which contained the image of Our Lady of Pilar, which by so many miracles had promised to defend the town, was battered down by bombs, and no longer inhabitable. The duke of Montebello deemed it necessary to take possession of the left bank of the river, in order that his fire might reach the middle of the town. The general of division, Gazan, made himself master of the bridge by a sudden and impetuous attack, on the morning of the 17th (February.) A battery of fifty pieces was played off at three in the afternoon. A battalion of the 28th regiment attacked and took possession of a very large monastery, the walls of which were of brick, and from three to four feet thick. General Gazan then repaired with rapidity to the bridge, over which the insurgents made their retreat to the town: he killed a vast number, made 4000 prisoners, amongst whom were two generals, 12 colonels, 19 lieut.-colonels and 230 officers. He took 30 pieces of artillery. Nearly all the troops of the town had beset this important post, which had been threatened since the 10th. At the same moment the duke of Abrantes entered the Casso through several covered ways, and by means of two mines, blew up the extensive buildings of the Schaals. After these events terror was spread throughout the town. The Junta, in order to procure delay, and obtain time to abate the terror of the inhabitants, sought a parley; but their bad faith was known, and this artifice was useless.—Thirty other houses were possessed by undermining, or by mines.—At length, on the 21st of Feb. the whole town was possessed by our troops: 15,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalry laid down their arms at the gate of Portilla, and 40 flags, and 160 pieces of cannon, were delivered up. The insurgents lost 20,000 men during the siege; 13,000 were found in the hospitals; 500 died daily. — The duke of Montebello would allow no capitulation to the town of Saragossa. He only published the following provisions:—[The garrison shall at noon, on the 21st, lay down their arms at the gate of Portilla, where they shall remain prisoners of war. Those of the troops of the line, who are willing to take the oath to King Joseph, may be allowed to enter into his service.—In case this entrance shall not be permitted by the minister of war to the king of Spain, they shall be pri-

soners of war and sent to France. The worship of God shall be reverenced. All the artillery and ammunition of every kind shall be delivered up. All the arms shall be deposited at the doors of the different houses, and collected by the respective Alcades.]—The magazines of corn, rice, and fruit, which have been found in the town, are very considerable. — The duke of Montebello has nominated general Laval governor of Saragossa.—A deputation of the priesthood and different inhabitants has set out for Madrid.—Palafax is dangerously ill. He was the object of the contempt of the whole hostile army, who accused him of arrogance and meanness. He was never seen where there was any danger.—The count de Fuentes, grandee of Spain, who had been arrested by the insurgents two months ago on his estates, and found in a dungeon of eight feet square, was released: no idea can be formed of the miseries he had undergone.”

**CAPTURE OF CAYENNE.**—*Capitulation proposed by Victor Hugues, Officer of the Legion of Honour, Commissioner of his Majesty the Emperor and King, Commander in Chief of Cayenne and French Guyana, and accepted by James Lucas Yeo, Post-Captain in his Britannic Majesty's Service, commanding the Combined Naval English and Portuguese Forces, and Manuel Marques, Knight of the Military Orders of St. Benoit d'Avie, Lieut. Col. in Chief, and Director of the Corps of Artillery of Para, commanding the advanced Army of the Portuguese, dated Jan. 12th, 1809.*

ALTHOUGH the advanced posts have been carried, and that the commissioner of the emperor and king is reduced with his garrison to the town, he owes it to those sentiments of honour which have always distinguished him, to the valour and good conduct of the officers and soldiers under his command, to the attachment of the inhabitants of the colony for his majesty the emperor and king, to declare publicly, that he surrenders less to the force than to the destructive system of liberating all the slaves who should join the enemy, and of burning all the plantations and ports where there should be any resistance. — The commissioner of the emperor commanding in chief, after having witnessed the burning of several plantations, particularly his own, the most considerable of the colony, had attributed it at first to the casualties of war; and the disorganization of the gangs, and the liberation of the slaves, appeared to him a momentary measure;

but being assured in writing, that the English and Portuguese officers acted in virtue of the orders of his royal highness the Prince Regent, and wishing to save the colony from total destruction, and to preserve his august master's subjects, who had given him so many proofs of their attachment and fidelity, the commissioner of his imperial and royal majesty surrenders the colony to the forces of his royal highness the Prince Regent on the following conditions:—Art. 1. The garrison shall march out with their arms and baggage and all the honours of war; the officers shall retain their side arms, and those of the staff their horses; the garrison shall lay down their arms, and engage not to serve against his royal highness and his allies during one year.—2. Vessels shall be furnished at the expence of his royal highness the Prince Regent, to carry the garrison, the officers civil and military, and all those employed in the service, with their families and effects, direct to France with as little delay as possible.—3. A convenient vessel shall be furnished to convey to France the commissioner of the emperor commanding in chief, his family, his officers, his suit and effects; the chief of the administration of the finances, the commander of the troops, the inspector and the commandant of artillery, with their families.—4. A convenient delay shall be granted to the officers who have property in the colony, to settle their affairs.—5. The arsenals, batteries, and every thing belonging to the artillery, the small arms and powder magazines, and the provision stores, shall be given up by inventory, and in the state in which they are now, and the same shall be pointed out.—6. The slaves on both sides shall be disarmed, and sent to their respective plantations.—The French negroes whom the Commanders by sea and land of his royal highness the Prince Regent have engaged for the service during the war, and to whom in virtue of their orders they have given their freedom, shall be sent out of the colony, as they can only remain there in future an object of trouble and dissension.—The Commanders engage, as they have promised, to solicit of his Royal Highness the Prince Regent the replacing of those slaves, as an indemnity in favour of the inhabitants to whom they belong.—7. The

papers, plans, and other articles belonging to the engineer department, shall be equally given up.—8. The sick and wounded who are obliged to remain in the colony may leave it, with all that belong to them, as soon as they are in a situation to do so; in the mean time they shall be treated as they have been hitherto.—9. Private property, of whatever nature or description, shall be respected, and the inhabitants may dispose of it as heretofore.—10. The inhabitants of the colony shall preserve their properties and may reside there, conforming to the orders and forms established by the sovereign under which they remain; they shall be at liberty to sell their properties and retire wherever it may suit them, without any obstacle.—11. The Civil Laws known in France under the title of the Napoleon Code, and in force in the colony, shall be observed and executed until the Peace between the two Nations; the magistrates shall only decide on the interests of individuals, and differences connected with them in virtue of the said laws.—12. The debts acknowledged by individuals during or previous to the time fixed by the preceding article, shall be exacted agreeably to the basis determined by the same article.—13. The papers concerning the controul and matriculation of the troops shall be carried away by the quarter master.—14. Desirous of preserving the spice plantation called La Gabrielle in all its splendour and agriculture, it is stipulated that neither it, nor any of the plantation trees or plants, shall be destroyed, but that it shall be preserved in the state in which it is given up to the Commanders of his royal highness the Prince Regent.—15. All the papers of the stores of inspection of the Customs, or of any responsibility whatever, shall be deposited in the Secretary's Office, or in any other place that may be agreed on, to be referred to when there is occasion; the whole shall be under the seal of the two governments, and at the disposal of his imperial and royal majesty.—16. The present Capitulation shall be written in the three languages and signed by the three officers stipulating.—At the advanced posts of Bourde, this 12th Jan. 1809.—(Signed) VICTOR HUGUES. JAMES LUCAS YEO. MANUEL MARQUES.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 13.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 1, 1809.

[Price 1s.

And now, perhaps, the glorious hour is come,  
When, having no stake left, no pledge t' endear  
Her int'rests, or that gives her sacred cause  
A moment's operation on his love,  
He burns with most intense and flagrant zeal  
To serve his country. Ministerial grace  
Deals him out money from the public chest ;  
Or, if that mine be shut, some private purse  
Supplies his need with an usurious loan,  
To be refunded duly when his vote,  
Well manag'd, shall have earn'd its worthy price.

481]

## DUKE OF YORK.

(Continued from page 457.)

UNDER this head I shall continue to place all the statements and remarks, growing out of, or immediately connected with, the recent Inquiry ; and, this head will, for some months, I dare say, be continued ; though we shall now have leisure to attend a little to other matters.—The affair of the *Rev. Mr. Glasse*, has not been cleared up. The public are in the dark with respect to it ; and, as it is useful to the public to be rightly informed as to the matter, I will here communicate what information, relative to it, I am in possession of.

—First, the public will bear in mind, that the name of *Dr. Glasse* was confounded with that of his son, *Mr. G. H. Glasse*, Rector of Hanwell.—Next, that *Donovan*, whom *Mrs. Clarke* said made the application to her, said, in his examination, that *Mr. Glasse knew nothing of the application* which he made to *Mrs. Clarke* in his favour.—To this is to be added, that *Mr. Glasse* has offered to make oath, that what *Donovan* has said, in this respect, is true, and, that an offer has been made, on the part of *Donovan*, to make an oath of the truth of what he, in this respect, declared during his examination.—There can be no doubt, therefore, that this is the real state of the case ; and, that the charge against *Mr. Glasse* is fairly reduced to that of being *an intimate acquaintance of Donovan*, with the addition of the probability of his (*Mr. Glasse's*) having known, that *Donovan* did intend to interest himself with *some person* or *other*, in favour of the views of *Mr. Glasse*.—Now, as to the former, *Mr. Glasse*, in a letter to me, says, that, for years, he “connected with the name of *Mr. Donovan* every thing that honour, principles, friendship, and gratitude could render

Oh innocent, compar'd with arts like these,  
Crape, and cock'd pistol, and the whistling ball  
Sent through the trav'ller's temples ! He that finds  
One drop of heav'n's sweet mercy in his cup,  
Can dig, beg, rot, and perish with content,  
So he may wrap himself in honest rags  
At his last gasp ; but could not for a world  
Fish up his dirty and dependent bread  
From pools and ditches of the commonwealth,  
Sordid and sick'ning at his own success.—

COWPER. *The Task.*

482

“ amiable in an old soldier.” We can, therefore, only, in this case, accuse *Mr. Glasse* of a want of discernment ; but, at the same time, I must say, that one cannot help believing, that he must have known something of *Donovan's* intention to make interest for him *somewhere* ; and, if that was the case (a point which I leave to the decision of the reader) he was very blameable indeed, however common the practice may be of obtaining church preferment by such means.—I have now to notice what it appears has been done, against *Mr. Glasse* by some authority in the Church ; and which will be best explained by inserting his letter, dated 16th March, “ TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE ‘SONS OF THE CLERGY,’ of which Society, or Charity, he was, it appears, the Secretary. “ GENTLEMEN, In the midst of “ my indignant surprise at the liberties “ which on a late public occasion had “ been taken with my name, I received a “ very intelligible hint, from a high quarter, that my voluntary resignation of “ the Secretaryship to your Charity would “ be an act decorous in itself, and, possibly, beneficial to the Institution.—My “ reply was short and simple, and it was “ this :—“ That as I was not aware of “ any delinquency on my part, either “ actual or intentional, I would not be afraid “ to incur dishonour, or skulk “ meanly from an ostensible situation, “ under an implied consciousness of “ guilt.”—I wish it therefore to be distinctly and generally understood, “ that in consequence of an authoritative “ mandate, and of that only, I have this day placed your Seal in the hands of my “ warm-hearted and unshaken friend, your “ honest, worthy Treasurer.—In times like “ these, when every wise man would covet “ and court retirement, it is in itself a mat- Q

“ ter of relief, rather than of regret, that I  
 “ am no longer to be called by the duties  
 “ of a laborious and expensive office, from  
 “ a home most dear to me. The conviction  
 “ of my mind, that my zealous exertions  
 “ were in no small degree advantageous to  
 “ your Charity, was the only considera-  
 “ tion that could have made me wish  
 “ to continue in the exercise of those  
 “ duties. I am now completely ab-  
 “ solved from them. But I do neverthe-  
 “ less protest, before God and you, against  
 “ the “ armed doctrine,” against the un-  
 “ just and tyrannous principle, on which  
 “ I am dismissed from your service—a  
 “ principle, by the application of which  
 “ to more important cases, an Englishman  
 “ would cease to be the guardian of his  
 “ own honour and character; and must be  
 “ contented to hold his reputation, his li-  
 “ berty, perhaps his life, at the mercy of  
 “ friends or of enemies, without any act  
 “ or participation of his own.”—This  
 “ authoritative mandate” proceeded from I  
 know not whom. Why will not people  
 give us names? There is not common sense  
 in this species of delicacy. How are we  
 to know, who to blame here, if blame be  
 due?—I will not stop to inquire into the  
 utility of this Society (for it is a matter upon  
 which there might be a good deal said);  
 but, supposing it to be connected, in some  
 sort, with the Church; supposing its re-  
 putation to be linked, in any way, with  
 that of the Church, I cannot say, that I  
 shou'd disapprove of what Mr. Glasse com-  
 plains of; because I hold it to have been very  
 improper for him to have been so closely  
 connected with a person like Donovan.  
 The frequency of such connections, and  
 of clergymen obtaining promotion through  
 such channels, does not lessen the fault  
 of Mr. Glasse. He has thus been censured;  
 and I really do not think the censure too severe.—Neither can I find, in  
 the measure, any thing contrary to sound  
 principles of justice. All that the Society  
 say to him is this: “we do not wish any  
 “ longer to have your services.” Surely,  
 they may act as they please, in an affair  
 of this sort. There was no need of any  
 trial, or investigation (if that be what Mr.  
 Glasse alludes to); the close intimacy  
 with Donovan having been stated, pro-  
 claimed, and acknowledged on the part  
 of Mr. Glasse, there was no occasion for  
 any thing further in the way of proof,  
 especially in a case, where the dismissed  
 party could sustain no injury, except in  
 point of feeling. It is very true, that the  
 proof of that intimacy was no proof of

guilt, actual or intentional; but, when  
 added to the fact of Donovan's having  
 made an application to Mrs. Clarke for  
 the preferment of Mr. Glasse, it does fairly  
 amount to a presumption injurious to his  
 reputation, in point of *discretion* at least;  
 and that being the case, I cannot agree  
 with him, as to the justice of his complaint  
 against those, who have been the cause of  
 his dismissal, which I look upon as a sort  
 of clerical censure, and as being the only  
 censure of that kind, which his superiors,  
 probably his diocesan, had it in his power  
 to inflict.—But, this being the case,  
 where, according to the principle, upon  
 which Mr. Glasse has been dismissed and  
 censured, shall we look for a defence of  
 those, who have contended, that the *Duke of York*  
 ought not to have been dismissed;  
 and who were the cause of preventing *his*  
 being formally censured? Where, upon  
 the principle, on which the Bishop of  
 London (for he, I take it, is meant) has  
 acted, shall we look for a defence of those  
 persons? If to be *acquainted with* a traf-  
 ficker in commissions and preferment, and  
 to have had an application made to Mrs.  
 Clarke, *without his consent or knowledge*, be  
 a ground sufficient for the censuring and  
 dismissing of Mr. Glasse; where are we  
 to look for a defence of those, who have  
 defended the *Duke of York*? And, above all,  
 where shall we look for a defence of those  
 of the *clergy*, who have acted this part? The  
*Duke of York* is, I believe, older than Mr.  
 Glasse, though some people would have  
 us suppose, that he has not yet cut his  
 wisdom teeth, and that Mr. Wardle has  
 been merely lancing his gums. The *Duke*  
 is too a *Doctor*, though the fact may not  
 be generally known. When he was at  
 Oxford, some years ago, the “Learned-  
 “ language” men of St. John’s College,  
 finding in him, I suppose, the requisite  
 qualities, gave him a diploma of *LL. D.*  
 And, I was told, that by mistake, they  
 were within an ace of presenting it to  
 one of his attendants, instead of himself.  
 This, which was told me in 1806, while I  
 was at Oxford, was one of the circum-  
 stances, which set me to estimating the  
 value of the understanding and the prin-  
 ciples, connected with the “learned lan-  
 “ guages.”—Well, then, he is a *Doctor*  
 of *Laces*; and, let us not be any longer  
 told, by the base panders of power, that  
 he was “*imposed upon*;” that he was  
 “*infatuated*,” and the like. He is a *Doctor*,  
 recollect, and Mr. Glasse is not; let their  
 cases be taken, and fairly compared, and  
 let those who can, reconcile the proceed-

ings against them respectively to any principle of impartiality. I do not find fault with the censure on Mr. Glasse; but, let me hear what those, who have censured him, or who have approved of that censure, will say of the Duke of York. Let me hear them. Do not tell me of their thoughts. Let me hear what they say. "How?" I shall be asked. In their sermons. They preach against Buonaparté; they preach against rebellion, and sedition; and, there was a time, when one half of what they said was about jacobinism. If they will not talk about the Duke, let us hear, at least, what they have to say about corruption, which leads to every thing that is destructive of the liberty of the people, and of the existence of the throne; or, if they will remain *nun*, let them preach to the bare walls. Let us, "bold divines," hear a little of the Church thunder upon this most abominable national sin. Are there no sermons upon it extant? Why, then, write some. Arouse all your pious indignation against this sin, ten thousand times more dangerous than that of stark-naked jacobinism. Come, come! None of your smoothing irons; none of your twisting and wriggling; none of your logic of evasion. Let us hear, in good plain English, what you have to say about what has now come to light. You often enough tell us of the denunciations of God against robbers, and you bid us not to steal. Now, then, when robbery of the public is joined to all the other vices; accompanied with all that is, at once, the most hateful and most contemptible; now let us hear what you have to say. When jacobinism was the order of the day, you were loud and distinct enough. Every news-paper teemed with sketches of your sermons, and every bookseller's window was crammed up with the sermons themselves. Well, then, let us now hear you. Let me see one amongst you; even one; a solitary individual of you, print a sermon upon this all-important subject, coming, in so many ways, under your immediate province. Dr. O'Meara, too, the divine of the "celestial unction," whose "lips were touched with the live coal from off the altar;" he, too, was ready to preach against the principles of the French *Democrats*; and, I would have my readers bear it in everlasting remembrance, that he preached this sermon, before the king, under the patronage, eritingly sought for, of a kept mistress of the king's son. This fact is, of itself, a pretty good com-

mentary upon the sermons against jacobinism, and upon all that has been prated and printed about "social order and our "holy religion," by those who have been pensioned and preferred for their literary services.—That eleven thousand parishes should not afford many clergymen, who hold in abomination the corruptions, which have been brought to light, it were uncandid in the extreme to affect to doubt; and, indeed, I have the honour personally to know some, who do so hold them. But, let us hear their voices *publickly*. Let me witness some little matter of that zeal, which made the book-shops teem with sermons against *jacobinism*. Let me see them "in earnest," as Dr. O'Meara says; let me see them in earnest upon this subject; or let them, for ever, seal up their lips, not only upon politics, but also upon breaches of the most important of our moral duties. Let us hear them a little upon "the desolation of abomination, standing "in high places;" or, let them leave the low to a quiet indulgence in their comparatively trifling sins. Let us hear Dr. Rennell, who thundered out upon the poor Nuns; who seemed to be more afraid of a string of beads than a thief is of a halter; who was, it is said, so instrumental in bringing forward an act of parliament to prevent our daughters' minds from being perverted by the said Nuns: let us hear what he has to say upon the *present occasion*. The Doctor has been noways bashful in his applications for the aid of the press. That press now presents him its best services; it sighs to become the vehicle of his eloquence, and, as a pledge of its friendship, beseeches him to forbear from his logical and polemic contests with Dr. Milner; the press loudly and earnestly invites the exertions of himself and his brethren, in the cause of political right and public morals, while, in that respect at least, it sets them an example.—"The Church in danger," was, some time ago, the cry. With what sincerity that cry was set up I shall not now inquire; but, certain I am, that the way to preserve the Church from real danger is for it to prove itself the friend of the people; of impartial justice, and of public morals. I know, that there are those, who think, that to take part against corruption is, in fact, to take part against *rank and property*. So they have thought all over Europe. Still, in spite of this awful expérience, there are many men, who so think, though they do not participate, or want to participate, in the profits of corruption. Fear, a fear arising from

imbecility, has, thus, co-operated with corruption; and, amongst all timid men, none are so timid as the clergy. But, it is strange; very strange indeed, that they see nothing to fear, *on the other side*. It is strange, that their apprehensions never turn towards the consequences of their taking part against the people. It is strange that they appear totally to overlook that maxim of the Gospel: “he who *is not for us*, *is against us*;” and that they seem to forget, that this maxim is grounded in human nature.—Thus it is, however; and thus, it would seem, we are to go on, in spite of all admonition; in spite of all warning; in spite of all experience. Concession to the reasonable wishes of the people, timely reformation, conciliation sought by just and honourable means; these have uniformly been rejected by the old governments of the continent, who have relied upon their power for checking even the progress of the mind.

—It is said: “if you go a step, in the way of concession, the people will make you go on, and will never be satisfied, ‘till they have destroyed all.” What is there to warrant this assertion? Is there any man, who preaches such doctrine as this? Are those, who wish for reform, desperate adventurers? Have any of us, who write against abuses, any thing covert in our expressions? Do we meet and plot? Is there a man of us, who can possibly propose to himself any advantage, but that which he would participate with his neighbours? Besides; what do we wish for? *We wish to destroy no establishment*. We want nothing new-fangled. We want no innovation. All we ask for is, such a reform as would effectually secure us against the effects of corruptions, such as have now been brought to light, and of the existence of which we have long been assured. Is this too much to ask? —There is no danger from concession to the people; and where such a fear exists, it is the offspring of knavery begotten upon imbecility; imbecility matchless in quality as well as in degree. The House of Commons lay before the people evidence, proof, of the existence of a system of corruption, under the effects of which it is impossible for any nation long to exist independent. And, the knaves, who fatten upon that corruption, have the impudence to assert, that to put an end to the system is the way to prowl the destruction of the establishments of the country, when it is so manifestly the interest of all those establishments to concur, and heartily

to co-operate, in putting an end to that system.—I trust that another way of thinking will, ere long, be produced; that knavery will soon lose its power over honest credulity; and that we shall see all men of worth join, leaving the knaves like a boat adrift upon the strand.

GENERAL CLAVERING's Case requires very little of statement now.—The chief facts, now, to be borne in mind, relate to the motives and manner of Clavering's coming forward.—It will be remembered, that, after Mrs. Clarke had undergone two or three of those examinations, which gained her so much credit, and her cross-examiners so little, Clavering wrote a letter to the Attorney General, stating that he had it in his power to prove, that she had given false testimony, and that he wished to be called to the bar for that purpose; that, after this letter had been read to the House, it was, upon motion of the friends of the Duke of York, resolved to call Clavering to the bar;—that, being so called, he denied the truth of what she had said, respecting certain communications with her, and, upon being cross-examined, did distinctly and positively assert, that “he did not know of any person, who had asked Mrs. Clarke to use her influence with the Duke as to Army promotions;”—that Mrs. Clarke, in order to show, that she had not been speaking falsehood with respect to Clavering, then produced a letter from the Duke of York to her, in answer to an application of hers in behalf of Clavering, in which letter the Duke desires her to tell Clavering, that his application, in the case in question, is useless;—that, in a few days afterwards, a bundle of Mrs. Clarke's papers, which she had sent down to light fires with at Hampstead, but which had been preserved by Nicholls, the master of the house, and which papers had been hunted out by the Duke of York's own Attorney, were brought to the bar, in the apparent hope of affording matter of discredit to Mrs. Clarke;—that, as the evil genius of General Clavering would have it, there were in this bundle of papers, five letters from the General to her, all beginning with the words “My dear Mrs. Clarke;”—that, in one of these letters, dated on the 5th of September, 1804, he explains the meaning of his former application, and says, “you mentioned that the Duke did not comprehend my proposal;”—that this letter bears date just eleven days after that of the Duke's letter to Mrs. Clarke, wherein he says, “Clavering is mistaken, my Angel;”—that,

in the fourth letter, dated the 11th of November, 1804, Clavering says : “ the pur-  
“ port of this letter is to thank you for your  
“ attempt to serve me ; ” —— that, some days  
after these letters had been published in  
the news-papers, Clavering again desired  
to be called to the bar ; —— that during  
this second examination, he acknowledged,  
that he had, upon one occasion, written  
a letter to her, “ stating, that, in case  
“ she obtained him permission to raise a regi-  
“ ment, she should receive a thousand pounds.”

— There were much shuffling and twisting, and many self-contradictions ; but here is the pith of the thing. Here we see him self-convicted of falsehood ; of voluntary, wilful, deliberate, premeditated falsehood.—For, observe, he comes forward a volunteer, for the avowed purpose of blasting Mrs. Clarke’s testimony ; of making her appear to be a liar ; and, of course, of nullifying all that she had said, or should say against the Duke of York, who was at the head of that army, in which he was an officer. It appeared from the evidence, that he had been to *Gordon*, who sent him to *Mr. Lowten* ; and, it was after this ; after consulting with the Duke’s Attorney, that he *asked* to be called to the bar, and, as he says, at the desire of Mr. Lowten, or by his advice.—So we see him here, actually holding council upon the mode, in which he shall proceed to blast the credit of his *patroness* and *benefactress*. She says, and, I think, there can be no doubt of the fact, that she got him the command of a district ; that she got him his Brigadiership ; that, in short, she was his only friend in this way, and the real cause of his promotion. But, at any rate, we find him, under his own hand, *thanking her for her endeavours to serve him* ; we find him making use of the most kind and complimentary expressions towards her ; we find him asking her permission to wait on her in boots ; and, this same man, when he thinks she was in a fair way of being crushed, voluntarily comes forward, under, as he thinks, the protection of irresistible power, and plots with her enemies for aiding in treading her into the dirt. Oh ! how little did he think, that the same Mr. Lowten, with whom he was holding consultation, was, though unwittingly, hard at work ; drawing forth all the resources of his ingenuity, for the purpose of bringing before the House of Commons, proof the most satisfactory, of *her truth*, of *his falsehood* ! How little did he think, that, instead of securing himself in what he had obtained by her means, and of paving the way for

future advancement, he was digging a pit for his destruction ! How little did he think, that, instead of throwing discredit upon her by this act of base ingratitude, he was adding to the secret stings of conscience open and ever-lasting shame ! He has, in the most complete manner that I recollect to have witnessed, verified the words of the Psalmist : “ His mischief shall return upon “ his own head, and his violent dealings “ shall come down upon his own pate.” He has been committed to Newgate for prevarication ; he is now in Newgate for falsehood, by an undivided vote of that Assembly, before whom he voluntarily came for the express purpose of fixing falsehood upon the character of his benefactress.—If ever man or woman was amply avenged ; if ever vengeance was more than glutted ; if ever the ever-craving human heart could say, “ I am satisfied,” such must be the language of the heart of Mrs. Clarke. All ; yea all and every one, who have practised, or attempted to practise, injustice or malignity against her, have been punished, in a degree, exactly proportioned to the magnitude of their offences. Some have been held up to ridicule, others have been checked in their pecuniary and other prospects ; others have been, or must be, compelled to disgorge and uncease ; he who, as she says, threatened her with the *pillory or the Bastile*, is in a state that I need not describe ; and he who came forward a volunteer to blast her credit, and cover her with infamy, is himself, upon his evidence from his own lips, and under his own hand, *lodged in Newgate*.—Mr. CHARLES WYNN, who made the motion against Clavering, who began with him, and who stuck to him to the last, is entitled to great praise on this account as well as being one of the 125, who voted for Mr. Wardle’s motion. There was no case so flagrant as that of this general, who, perhaps, was and is, a member of the famous “ *Military Club*.” That should be ascertained. The thing is interesting. It is worth coming at. It would be curious enough if he had a hand in the attempted, the Ferrol-like expedition, that Mr. Whitbread brought under the cognizance of the House.

Mentioning this Club puts me in mind of another, introduced, the other day, to the notice of the public, in a news-paper paragraph, thus : “ At the *Higland Club*, “ in Cockspur-street, held at the British “ Coffee-house, on Tuesday evening, a “ very numerous company assembled. The “ Marquis of Huntley was called to the “ chair, and the health of the Duke of York

"was drank with three times three."—This Marquis of Huntley, is, I believe, a son of the old Duchess of Gordon. I would recommend to this Highland Club, the next time they meet, to finish their projected devices in honour of the Highland corps, for taking that invincible standard, which was taken by Lertz, a native of France, and who had not the honour to serve in that corps, or any Highland corps. Let this Club give us their names, and let us see how many of them are upon the pension and sinecure lists, contained in Lord Cochrane's political bible. Let us have their names. They, surely, must have names of some sort or other; and, if they stand in clans, let us have them numbered, as we do bales of goods. If it be worth while to publish their *toasts*, it is worth while to let us know the persons, who drank the *toasts*. Will they not come out? Why, then, let them skulk, and let us laugh at their silly *toasts* and them too.

The excellent disposition, which has been excited and called forth by the disclosures, for which the public are indebted to Mr. Wardle, is manifesting itself, in every part of the country; and this is the really valuable part of the thing. It is not the dismissal of the Duke of York, or his resignation, call it what you will, that any sensible man cares much about. Of itself, that is of little public importance. It is the light, the blessed light that has been let in upon a long benighted nation, by the inquiry that has taken place. Many men, indeed, saw clearly before; but that light which before got in upon us through here and there a crevice, has now made a general burst, while all the plastering and patching and rags and clouts and lumps of clay have tumbled down about the ears of those who wished to keep us in darkness eternal. Even the provincial papers; so long the vehicles of dull repetition, of borrowed and insipid reflection; so long "the weed that rots in Lethe's pool," have now assumed animation and mind; have now begun to have the breath of life in their nostrils, and to indicate the possession of intelligent souls. Many of these papers have, within this month, been sent to me. Many that I never saw before in my life. The parts wished to be read have been pointed out with a mark of the pen:—as, if they came to me and said: "See, we have, at last, opened our eyes, and no longer merit your reproaches." Vanity may have suggested this idea to me; but, this is the light in which I view it.—There is one

thing that gives me particular satisfaction; and that is, to see that the cry of *Jacobinism*, set up before the meeting of parliament by Richard Wharton,\* who is, I believe, the Chahman of the Ways and Means Committee with a salary of £1,200 a year, and so loudly echoed since; it does give me particular, and inexpressible pleasure, to see that this cry is universally held in its merited contempt; and that, instead of having answered its intended purpose, it has had no small share in producing that conviction of the necessity of a reform, now held to be inseparable from national safety.—As an instance of the effect, which has thus been produced, and as a specimen of the good spirit which has gone forth, I shall here insert one extract from the OXFORD Paper of the 25th of March:—"The Duke of York has at last tendered his resignation of the office of Comander in Chief, to the King; and his Majesty has been graciously pleased to accept it. This resignation had at length become a matter of absolute necessity: to the last stage the Duke was defended with all the power and influence of administration; but although the servants of the crown could command a majority in the House of Commons, the voice of the people could not be suppressed by their authority; and if their representatives would not address the Sovereign for the removal of this great Officer of State, they would themselves, in their public assemblies throughout the kingdom, have petitioned the Throne for his dismission. To avert this general expression of public opinion, the Duke of York has resigned, but not before an important article of instruction has been given to those into whose hands the elective franchise is confided. We regret that Ministers have not come forward in an open and manly manner, and declared that they have no intention of reinstating his Royal Highness in his former situation. Till this is done, the people,—nine-tenths of the people of England,—who suspect that this will ere long take place, will continue to be highly dissatisfied with their conduct.—The Inquiry is now terminated by a decision, at which, when we compared it with certain parts of the printed evidence, and particularly with the letters written by his Royal Highness to Mrs. Clarke, we could not help expres-

\* This is not the Mr. Wharton, who voted with MR. WARDLE.

“ sing our astonishment. But the decision, however extraordinary and unaccountable it may appear to ourselves and others, is of little importance in comparison with the good effects which are likely to result from the previous most important investigation. A spirit of inquiry is gone forth, which we hope will scrutinize into every department of the state, and expose to view every hidden abuse. The people, at length recovered from their lethargy, will begin to inquire whether those men who have been so long accustomed to charge others, whose opinions were different from their own, with disloyalty, and to brand them with opprobrious epithets, did this from a consciousness of superior purity in themselves, or whether they acted thus to prevent any inquiry taking place, which they were sensible would be detrimental to their own individual and personal interests; whether these were not the very men who lived by abuses, and who battened on that corruption which, they very well knew, was sapping the basis of the English constitution. But, above all, this spirit of inquiry will be directed to the enormous profusion of the public money: actuated by this spirit, the people will ask their representatives, whether the product of the taxes be solely applied to objects which tend to contribute to the safety, happiness, and honour of the British Empire, or whether a great part be not applied to the payment of pensions, bestowed without previous and equivalent services, or of sinecure places; whether a great part be not expended on pensioners who have done nothing, and on place-men who have nothing to do? If such abuses do really exist, who but the interested will deny that they call loudly for a temperate, but a speedy and radical reform?”—Yes, these are the sentiments to inculcate; and to be inculcated particularly by those, whose interest it is to prevent that which is called *revolution*. By timely reform the several governments of the continent of Europe might have saved themselves, and along with themselves their nobles and all their establishments. They universally resisted reform. Instead of disarming the philosophers and the demagogues by removing those well-known and undeniable abuses, which gave currency to their statements and their doctrines, what have we seen those governments do? Invariably add to those abuses, and calumniate and punish all those, within their reach, who complained

of them. The consequences are before us; and, those who are proof against this 20 years' lesson, will not be convinced, “though one were to rise from the dead.” There was, in Mr. Whithbread's speech of the 10th of March, a very beautiful and impressive passage upon the lesson, given to the Duke of York, in the circumstance of his mistress having purchased the service of family plate of the *Duc de Berri*. But, have you, Sir, seen any prince discover any sensibility of this sort? Have they, any where, shown much feeling for one another? But, I do hope, that now, at any rate, the gentlemen of this country; that the nobility; that all men of rank and property will see, that the time is come for them to show, that they have a sense of the danger, to which corruption inevitably leads; and that, after a long season of apparent insensibility to their own consequence, as well as to the interests of others, they will heartily co-operate in producing that reform, which alone can save them and us and all from ruin and disgrace.—There are few things that have given me greater pleasure, than the seeing of the name of *Sir Henry Mildmay* in the list of those 125 members, who voted with Mr. Wardle; and, I trust, that the people of *this county* will neither forget that, nor that neither of the county members, *Chute* and *Heathcote*, is to be found in that list. Sir Henry Mildmay does not, apparently, admire the situation of a tool. He does not appear to be enamoured with the idea of being the under-strapper of an upstart. He does not seem to think it much of an honour to crawl under the canopy of a mushroom. To be sure, it is something so preposterous; it is something so unnatural; it is something so much against every good feeling of the heart, to see a man of fixed fortune and estate, of ancient family and of sound mind, become the dependent, the miserable echo, of an echo, and to seek for consequence in being thought to be intimate with those who are themselves miserable dependants; there is something so shockingly unnatural in this, that the very existence of a single instance of the sort is enough to blast the character of a nation. Yet, there are many instances of the sort; and, what it can be owing to, unless to the foolish, the cowardly fear of *revolution*, I cannot imagine; that fear, which, as I said before, the knaves, who fatten upon the public misery, are so industrious in cherishing, by all the means in their power. But, the timid fools do not perceive, that the knaves have an interest

separate from theirs, and even opposed to it. A reform that would be salutary to the nation, would be destructive to them; and, when they talk of "overturning every thing," that every thing means their plunder. To them it is no matter whether a reform take place, or whether the nation be conquered by the enemy. They must be ruined in either case. But, it is not so with a man like Sir Henry Mildmay. He would, in all probability, be ruined by the country's being conquered; but he must, in common with the rest of the country, greatly gain by a salutary reform, especially as that reform would secure the internal peace and order of the country.—But, in all countries that I have ever heard of, the knaves, who live only upon abuses, have, to a great degree, at least, succeeded in persuading the fools, that, to stand by them, was the way to secure themselves and their property.—In like manner have they, but too often, succeeded in working up princes to be on their side, the latter seldom having had the discernment to perceive, that their interest was different from that of the knaves. This has been the fruitful cause of revolutions and dethronings; of princes reduced below the level of common men, and of nobles extinguished and forgotten in a month.—Let us hope, that knavery will not succeed here; that those who have the power, will also have the will, to resist it; and, if this be the case, we have nothing to fear from foes without or demagogues within.—What, but this working of knavery upon imbecility; what but this can have prevented so many princes, and so many bodies of nobles and rich men, from adopting, in time, measures calculated to regain the confidence and affections of the people, without which, as daily experience convinces us, there is no means of effectual national defence against such an enemy as we have now to contend with?

The press has, in general, done its duty in scotching the idea of "a conspiracy existing against the House of Brunswick;" but, there is one paper, *the Morning Post*, which has acted, and is acting, a very base as well as profligate part, and which I am very glad to hear, has, in its regular decline, given a pretty good proof of the public sentiment. From this paper I shall here insert an extract, first begging the reader to bear in mind, that (as I stated upon a former occasion) during Mr. Paull's contest for Westminster, he accused a Gentleman, of the name of Roninson, who lived then in Devonshire Place, and who had

been in some high office in India, under Lord Wellesley, of causing paragraphs to be published against him in the *Morning Post*; that he charged this gentleman and other East India people of being proprietors of that paper; and that I saw and read a letter from this Mr. Robinson to Mr. Paull, in which letter the writer disclaimed all knowledge of the paragraph complained of, and in which he expressed his disapprobation of all such paragraphs, but in which letter he stated, that he was a part proprietor of the paper, and that it was owned by him and others, chiefly East Indians, and was possessed and carried on in the same way as the concern of any other commercial company.—This is a fact always to be kept in view, when we are examining the politics of this paper. And now let us hear what this vehicle says upon the subject of *jacobinism* and of a *conspiracy against the house of Brunswick*, bearing in mind, that, for several years past, this paper has been, without a single exception, the defender and the eulogist of every person, who has been accused of corruption, bribery, peculation, public profligacy, or any other offence against the interests or the morals of the country. —“When the fair domain of common sense and reason is devastating by a torrent, perhaps the wisest, and certainly the least dangerous conduct, were self only considered, would be passively to suffer it to exhaust its fury, and to wait the return of the calm, before we attempted to divert its baneful course. But as Britons, as men attached to the glorious Constitution of our Country, as men dreading the horrors of Anarchy and Revolution, as participants in the Liberty of the Press, and in some measure called upon by our writings to maintain its legitimate rights, can we stand idly by nor make an effort to open the eyes of our deluded fellow citizens, to the turbid and impure source from whence this torrent flows, and the dreadful issue to which its progress tends.—What we have all along foreseen, and what, as well as a sense of justice, induced us to take the part we did, in the inquiry into the conduct of the Commander in Chief, is now rapidly fulfilling. The blow was not struck at the Duke of York, but at the House of Brunswick, and the Constitution of England, —it has been to a certain extent, well placed, and (to continue in the scientific language of pugilism) is now to be followed up. But those who aim the blow have no physical power in themselves;

" known, they are detested by all men, and it is only when they can delude the people to their side, that there is any strength in their arm.—Their art is to *hide the cloven foot*, and, under an assumed form, take the advantage of a popular feeling, excited and fomented by their vile stratagems, and, by working on this fertile soil, turn to their own horrible purposes, passions which are perhaps founded in virtue, and directed to the reform of abuse, not to the overthrow of Government. It is to guard against this specious delusion; it is to warn our countrymen against lending themselves, under the idea of correcting errors, to the views of those mercenary and villainous men who plot the destruction of all that is dear to us; it is to open their eyes to the dangers which surround them, that we dare, even contrary to their now ruling persuasion, to call on them for reflection and a short pause, before they plunge into the stream from which in its course there is little hope they will at any future period be able to extricate themselves.—It is with grief and concern we daily witness what twenty or thirty intriguing and Jacobinical spirits can compass with the British public. It is with deep shame and sorrow, that we see the noblest feelings of human nature made subservient to the basest purposes of a detested Faction. It is with heartfelt anguish that we behold the real, patriot, and in-born love of liberty of the British people, turned by the cunning of those whose idea of liberty is licentiousness, and whose minds are intent on nothing but *revelling on the plunder of a Nation*, overthrown to aid their projects and consummate their plans.— Such do we consider the addresses to Mr. Wardle, whose accusations the representatives of the people have pronounced to be unfounded; such do we consider the subscriptions to Miss Taylor, the associate of the most infamous prostitute of the age: such do we consider the instigations to hold public meetings; and such do we consider every act connected with or promoting these objects.—Let the Public reflect for a moment who the wretches are that set these matters on foot. Can they imagine for a moment that a base notorious libeller, his associates, or his miserable satellites, are inspired by a love of their country or of virtue to engage so ardently in these schemes; or must they not rather instantly acknowledge that there is something ulterior in view yet hid from their sight, which is to be attained

" by these means? What is Mr. WARDLE, or Miss TAYLOR, or Mrs. CLARKE, or the Duke of YORK, to these designing men, but as so many objects by which they can promote their grand design against the Government of the Country?—Is their duty now so rarely performed by our public Men—by our Opposition Virtue-mongers, as seldom as by our Ministerial Optimists, that Mr. Wardle must be denominated for having done his? That is, for having, from a suspicious connection with an infamous prostitute, been induced to bring forward charges against a Member of the Illustrious House of BRUNSWICK, which, by a signal and triumphant majority of 241, have been declared to be unfounded.—Oh, fortune-favoured NAPOLEON! even the patriotism of Britain aids thee in the attainment of thy ambitious hopes. Every thing conspires to render thee invincible. The Chronicle of London fights thy battles against Austria. The Patriots in the British Senate fight thy battles against established crowns and legal constitutions.”—After this the writer goes on to repeat what Mr. WINDHAM said: “that there was no act of which the Duke of York was accused, of which he would not rather be found guilty than of having taken away, without her consent, and against her will, the letters taken from Mrs. Clarke by Mr. Wardle.”—Of all that was said, during the whole of the debates, nothing gave me any pain but this; and, I cannot help hoping, that, in spite of this repetition, there must have been some misrepresentation. To be sure, if Mr. Wardle had so acted from any view of advancing his own interest; if the affair, to which the letters had related, had been a private one; if it had been between man and man, and had been unconnected with the duty of Mr. Wardle as a member of parliament; if this had been the case, there might have been some doubt as to the propriety of his conduct, though, even then, the question must have turned wholly upon the circumstances of the case. For, suppose you to see, in the hands of any one, papers proving the commission of a murder, are you to let such papers escape you? No, perhaps, it will be said; but go and lay the information, leaving it to others to seize the papers. But, where is the difference between giving this information and seizing the papers yourself? So, then, for anything that you care, the murderer is to escape; he is to be left with his sharpened knife in his hand, rather than you will

be "guilty" of seizing the proofs of his guilt.—So much for this doctrine when applied to a private case; but, suppose you to see, in the possession of a friend; of a brother; nay, of that nearest and dearest of all connections, a parent or a child, papers containing proofs of *treason*, committed, or to be committed? Would you not seize these papers, or give information (which is precisely the same thing, of their existence? I put this question home to you; and beg you to remember, that if you failed to do it, you would be liable to be hanged for the failure. And, shall the law tell us this; shall it thus act, in behalf of the king, and be applauded for so acting, while one of the makers of that law tells us, that it is an offence to act in behalf of *the public*, upon the principles of that law? We may differ in our estimate of the relative magnitude of *robbery of the public* and of *conspiracy against the king*; but, without entering into any argument upon that point, I think that few persons will be found to deny, that it is impossible to justify the law of misprision of treason, unless you allow, that it would have been a *crime* in Mr. Wardle not to have availed himself of the best means within his power, of securing the proof of public robbery, of the existence of which he had obtained the knowledge.

—The system of spies and informers is interwoven with our system of finance, and I do not recollect that Mr. Windham ever made opposition to any of those laws. No, all is good; all advantages are fair which operate in favour of those who rule; but if you take advantage of any circumstance in favour of the public, you are accused of acting a *mean* and *dastardly* part; as if the government was a thing so weak and so very defenceless!—This is like many of the clergy, who were amongst the first; who were, indeed, the very first, to encourage spies and informers against the *Jacobins and Levellers*, and to justify all the means, of whatever description, to come at proofs of their machinations. But, behold, when the bitter chalice was put to their own lips; when, in 1800, or thereabouts, *qui tam* informations were laid against them for having neglected their bounden and sacred duties, they could then set up a loud and general cry against *informers*, whom they represented as the most infamous of mankind; they could come to the parliament for a law to suspend the operation of these informations; aye, for an *ex post facto* law to protect them against *informers*; and, what

is still better worthy of being remembered, they found a parliament to pass such law.—I will not cram up my space and occupy the time of the reader with any commentary upon what I have extracted from the *Morning-Post*. It is the mere echo of what we have heard else-where, and what already stands admirably exposed to public contempt. Yes, it is too late to tell us, that to bring to light, and to execrate corruption and public robbery, it is too late to tell the people; that this indicates a desire to overturn the House of Brunswick and the constitution of England; that this indicates a plot for the effecting of a bloody jacobinical revolution, and that those, who voted with Mr. Wardle, fight the battles of Buonaparté against established crowns and legal constitutions. The people of England, as Mr. LYTTLETON (who is one of the jacobins) said, are no longer to be duped; and, what is still more satisfactory to observe, a very great part of the nobility and gentlemen of England, and that part, too, *who are to live for an age to come*, seem to have now imbibed the same contempt for the means that have been used for the purpose of deceiving them into a belief, *that it was their interest to side against the great mass of the nation*. Completely to eradicate this belief, the folly of which yields to that of no creed that imposture ever invented for the purposes of subjection and of plunder, is all that is wanted to bring about that *general reform*, of which Mr. Whitbread spoke the other day, and without which all but those, who fatten or wish to fatten, upon public plunder, are so anxious to see brought about.—It is not the "rabble," who call for such a reform. The rabble, properly so called (and more or less of rabble there always will be,) profit from abuses and corruptions. They are peculators and plunderers of another sort, and different look, to be sure; but still they are peculators and plunderers. No: it is those who suffer from the rabble, who know them well, and who are so anxious about nothing as to keep power out of their hands.—I cannot refrain from a remark or two upon the passage, relating to Miss TAYLOR, the only accusation that this base writer prefers against whom, is, that she was the *associate* of Mrs. Clarke, whom he denominates the "*most infamous prostitute of the age*"; forgetting, apparently, that she was so long the great patroness of the army; the Venus of our great and mighty Mars; the "*darling*" of his affections, the "*Angel*" of his de-

votions, and his connection with whom this very writer has apologized for, not to say justified, in numerous essays. Oh! pander of incomparable impudence; to vilify the goddess while he extols the votary, and justifies the devotion!

Thanks to Mr. Wardle have, as will be seen below, been voted by the City of Westminster.—I perceive, that the *Mayor of London* has, at last, after much boggling, and many difficulties, called a Common Hall, at which his difficulties ought not to be forgotten.—The people of *Glasgow* have shown an admirable spirit, and set an example worthy of general imitation. They have sent, through Lord Folkestone, an address to Mr. Wardle (a copy of which was inserted in my last, at page 454) with upwards of *four thousand NAMES* at the bottom of it. This is what I like. That man can never be depended upon; he is not worth a straw, if he is not ready to put his *name* to the expression of his sentiments. In some cases it is inconvenient; in others nearly impossible; but, where practicable, it is always the best way.—This very great inconvenience the people of Glasgow have, I am informed, had *forced* upon them. Their intention, at first, was to call a public meeting; but, their requisition was refused by the Provost. The next step determined on was to advertise in the news-papers; but all their news-papers refused to publish their advertisements. They then posted bills, and distributed printed papers; and, in six days, these four thousand names were signed.—These are the sort of men; men, who see no difficulties too great to be overcome. These 4000 men would, in the defence of their country, be worth ten millions of those balancing, timid, sheep-like creatures, who wait for a bellwether to lead the way. Scotland, I shall honour thee, as long as I live, for the sake of Glasgow! Where there are such men for a population, there is no danger to be apprehended from the undue influence of persons in authority, nor even from that base and servile press, which appears to exist in Scotland.—In this work of stifling in the birth, or rather, of preventing the existence, of thanks to Mr. Wardle, the *Whigs* (always excepting those who voted in the 125) are not at all inferior to their political opponents. They plainly see, that their doom is sealed; that the people care about their regular sham-fights no more than they do about the great fights upon Black-Heath or Wimble-

don Common; that they are fast sinking under the waves; and, seeing this, they are bursting with spleen and envy. Hence they are sulky; they preserve a sullen silence; or unlock their lips only for the purpose of emitting their drivel for the extinguishment of real public spirit. If this worn-out, this decrepit, this dotard, this dying party, had not seen enough before, to convince it, that the days of political quackery were past, it would, surely, see it now, if total loss of sight had not preceded its dissolution. This party, which had raised the greatest of expectations, deceived the people more than they ever were deceived before. They had got into favour by professions about reform and retrenchment: they obtained power: the first act of that power was to pass a law to make a great sinecure office tenable along with a place of 6,000*l.* a year, though the two offices were incompatible in their natures; their second act was to pass a law making an addition to the number of *foreign troops* in the country; and, their last act was, the withdrawing of a bill from before the House of Commons, in consequence of the king's disapprobation of that bill; and this, too, for the evident and sole purpose of keeping their places. Can they be so infatuated as to suppose, that there is a single man in the country, out-of-a madhouse, who will ever confide in them again? They have dug a pit for themselves; their recent conduct has plunged them into it; the nation is now kicking the dirt in upon them; Dr. O'Meara may daub them over with his celestial unction; but, not a tear will be shed for their loss, *except by the ministers*, to whom the loss will, in time, be fatal.—Here follow the RESOLUTIONS passed by a Meeting of ten thousand people in Westminster, on Wednesday, the 29th of March.—

#### Resolved Unanimously—

“ 1st. That the inhabitants of this City, from the means of information which their local situation affords them, *have long been aware of the existence of scandalous and corrupt practices in various departments of the State*, and by the late investigation in the hon. the House of Commons, the fact has been made manifest to every part of the United Kingdom.

“ 2nd. That Gwyllim Lloyd Wardle, esq. by his singular intrepidity and integrity in instituting an Inquiry into the conduct of his royal highness the Duke of York, and by persevering in that Inquiry, in

spite of the greatest difficulties and the most formidable discouragements, has rendered an important service to his country, and merits the grateful thanks and warmest approbation of this Meeting.

" 3d. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to our worthy Representative, sir F. Burdett, bart. for the independent manner in which, at a very important moment, and under very *critical* circumstances, he seconded the Motion for Inquiry; for the assistance which, as far as his health permitted, he afforded during its progress, and for the able and patriotic Speech which under the pressure of great bodily pain, he delivered *on the result of the Investigation*: thus adding one more to the many proofs he has already given, that he is the *faithful steward* of that body, by whose free and spontaneous voice he was so honourably elected.

" 4th. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to lord viscount Folkestone, for the active, judicious, and firm support he afforded to col. Wardle during the Investigation; and for his manly, able, and perspicuous Speech on the Conduct of the Commander-in-Chief.

" 5th. That the Thanks of this Meeting are particularly due to Samuel Whitbread, esq., sir Samuel Romilly, knt., major-gen. Ferguson, Henry Martin, esq., sir Thomas Turton, bart., Thomas William Coke, esq., John Christian Curwen, esq., the hon. Thomas Brand, the hon. H. W. Lyttleton, lord viscount Milton, lord viscount Althorp, Chas. Watkin Williams Wynne, esq., lord Stanley, and the Minority of 125, who divided in favour of colonel Wardle's Motion for an Address to the King, on the Conduct of the Duke of York, and the Minority of 137, who supported the Amendment proposed by sir Thomas Turton, bart.

" 6th. That the Thanks of this Meeting be also given to the Minority, on the motion of Henry Banks, esq.; and also to the Minority who opposed the Motion of the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and it is their unanimous opinion, that, after the concurring declaration of so many Independent Representatives of the People, whoever shall, at any future time, advise His Majesty to reinstate his royal highness the Duke of York in the situation of Commander-in-Chief, will, by such advice, prove himself an enemy to the country.

" 7th. That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that the discoveries made by this Inquiry, as well as the attention which has

been paid in the House of Commons to the investigation of the Charges brought in this particular instance, ought to animate the people to prosecute Inquiry and Reform in all the departments of the State; and they recommend to every county, city, and borough of the United Kingdom, in which the present state of the Elective Franchise will admit it, to follow the example which it has been the duty and pride of the City of Westminster to set them, of returning, free of expense, honest and independent Representatives; who shall have no interest but that of restoring what is obviously wanted—integrity and economy, in the receipt and expenditure of the public money, and of preserving inviolate the rights and privileges of the people.

" ARTHUR MORRIS, High Bailiff.

" It was then also unanimously Resolved,

" That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Arthur Morris, esq., high bailiff, for the promptness with which he called this Meeting, and for his able and impartial Conduct in the Chair."

—There is but *one word*, that I dislike in these Resolutions, and that is the word *Colonel*. Not *Colonel*, but *Mister*. After what we have recently seen, let us, I pray you, have it plain *Mr. Wardle*.—These are good sentiments. It is useless to talk: they must prevail. There must be a salutary, constitutional, legal, loyal reformation; a *radical reform*, from Christ's Hospital to St. Stephen's Chapel, or this nation sinks into everlasting ruin.—Mr. Whitbread was, I hear, at this meeting, and took an active part. That is good. It shews, that he has broken through the cursed trammels of faction; that he is, at last, weary of an association with the Sheridans and Fitzpatricks. Foh! Oh! it was truly lamentable to see him so yoked.—Well, now, were these *ten thousand jacobins*? Tremble, then, Mr. Yorke, for the "*conspiracy*" is formidable indeed, though you can, I think, no longer complain, that it does not appear in a "*tangible shape*". Is it not the best, and wisest, and safest way, for the government to set about a radical reform at once, to anticipate all these jacobins, and so spite the rogues? Perhaps you will tell me, that there are millions upon millions of good and solid reasons why this will not be. But, there are 126 men, even in the House of Commons, who demand a statement of these weighty reasons. They, who are almost all of them,

men of great property, do not seem to fear the consequences of a reform. Poor fools! what, I warrant, they do not understand what is good for them half so well as Mr. Huskisson and Mr. Canning and Mr. Wardle and General Fitzpatrick and Lord Castlereagh do? Poor silly young fellows! they are, as the Morning Post says, misled by “designed men;” or, as Mr. Perceval has it, by “cooler heads.” And so, they, however plain the thing may be, cannot see, that it does them good to take out of their estates immense salaries for Mr. Huskisson and Mr. Wardle, and pretty decent pensions for their wives. They cannot see, country cubs that they are, how it is that they and their children are to be benefited by paying £300 to *Lady Louisa Paget*, upon the English pension list, and another £300 a year to the same identical person, under the name of *Lady Louisa Erskine*, upon the Scotch pension list. It is useless to enumerate any more cases; for if they are blind to the benefit here, so they would continue to the end of the chapter, which, by-the-by, is a pretty long one.—To be serious, these 126 men shew that a Reform must take place. Truth has triumphed, and the vile writers, the vile traders, the reptile and venomous traders in Anti-Jacobinism must be trodden under foot; a triumph, for which amongst other things, we have to thank Mr. Wardle.

*Botley, Thursday, 30th March, 1809.*

In speaking of the *List of the Minority* upon Mr. Wardle’s Motion, I observed, that there were only two lawyers in it. I did not know that Mr. HENRY MARTIN was a lawyer, and I overlooked the name of Mr. FRANCIS HORNER. I beg these gentlemen to be assured, that the omission to mention them as gentlemen of the law was not intentional.

A correspondent points out an error in my statement respecting Mr. Adam’s son’s promotion. Any one must see that, supposing the thing to stand as my correspondent supposes, it was a mere error; because it is *impossible*, that it should have been intentional, as I myself furnished the means of detection.—Nor does it at all alter the merits of the case. But, the thing is even worse than I represented it; for, a Captain in the Guards ranks with a Major of other foot regiments, and a Lieutenant with Captains of other foot regiments; so that, in any Garrison, or Camp, Lieut. Adam, just warm from school, in 1799, at the age of sixteen, might have

taken the command of other regiments as well as of his own company; for, how often does it happen, that the command of a regiment is left to a *Captain Lieutenant?*—An account, which I will give, one of these days, of the way in which it was managed to get this young man on, with a positive and direct violation of the rule not to promote one man over the head of another, in the same corps, will be highly amusing.

The Electors of Westminster have published the Speech of Sir Francis Burdett, upon the Conduct of the Duke of York.

It is my intention to have published a List of the 125 members, who voted with Mr. Wardle. To have it printed upon fine and stout paper, capable of being framed, and preceded by the motion, and a succinct history thereof; so that it may be hung up, and read as one sits before the fire.—It would be very desirable to have the List of those who voted against him. Can no one assist me in this? It would be a most valuable thing for the nation to possess. Much more valuable than “*Our Empire in the East.*”

---

### COBBETT’S COMPLETE COLLECTION OF State Trials:

To be completed in Thirty-Six Monthly Parts, forming Twelve large Volumes in Royal Octavo.

The FOURTH PART of the above Work is this day published. One Part will appear, with the greatest regularity, on the first of each succeeding Month. Those Subscribers who have expressed their intention of taking the Work in Quarterly Volumes, are respectfully informed that the First Volume is now ready for delivery.

---

### COBBETT’S Parliamentary Debates:

The TWELFTH VOLUME is in the Press. All Communications for the above Work, if sent to the Publishers in due time, shall be carefully attended to.

---

### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND SPAIN.—*Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Alliance between his Britannic Majesty and his Catholic Majesty Ferdinand VII.* Signed at London, the 14th of Jan. 1809.

In the name of the Most Holy and

Undivided Trinity :—The events which have taken place in Spain having terminated the state of hostility which unfortunately subsisted between the crowns of Great Britain and Spain, and united the arms of both against the common enemy, it seems good that the new relations which have been produced between two nations, now connected by common interest, should be regularly established and confirmed by a formal Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Alliance : Wherefore his Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the Supreme and Central Junta of Spain and the Indies, acting in the name and on the behalf of his Catholic Majesty, Ferdinand VII. have constituted and appointed ; that is to say, his Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the right hon. George Canning, one of his Majesty's most honourable Privy Council, and his principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs ; and the Supreme and Central Junta of Government of Spain and the Indies, acting in the name and on behalf of his Catholic Majesty Ferdinand VII. Don Juan Ruiz de Apodaca, Commander of Vallaga and Algarga in the military order of Calatrava, rear admiral of the royal Navy, named by the Supreme and Central Junta of Government of Spain and the Indies, as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of his Catholic Majesty Ferdinand VII. to his Britannic Majesty ; their Plenipotentiaries, to conclude and sign a treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Alliance ; who, having communicated their respective Full Powers, have agreed to and concluded the following Articles :—Article 1. There shall be between his Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and his Catholic Majesty Ferdinand VII. King of Spain and of the Indies thereunto appertaining, and between all their kingdoms, states, dominions, and subjects, a Christian, stable, and inviolable peace, and a perpetual and sincere amity, and a strict alliance during the war against France ; together with an entire and lasting oblivion of all acts of hostility done on their side, in the course of the late wars, in which they have been engaged against each other.—2. To obviate all complaints and disputes which might arise on the subject of prizes, captured posterior to the declaration published by his Britannic Majesty on the 4th of July of the last year it has been mutually agreed, that the vessels and property taken posterior to the

date of the said declaration, in any seas or ports of the world, without any exceptions, and without any regard either to time or place, shall be restored by both parties. And as the accidental occupation of any of the ports of the Peninsula by the common enemy, might occasion disputes respecting any vessels, which, in ignorance of such occupation, might direct their course to those ports from any other harbour, either of the Peninsula or the colonies ; and as cases may occur in which Spanish inhabitants of the said ports or provinces, so occupied by the enemy, may, with their property, endeavour to escape from his grasp ; the High Contracting Parties have agreed that Spanish vessels, not aware of the enemy's occupation of any harbour which they are desirous to enter, or such as may succeed in making their escape from any harbour so occupied, shall not be captured, nor themselves nor their cargo be considered as a good prize ; but, on the contrary, that they shall meet with every help and assistance from the naval power of his Britannic Majesty. 3. His Britannic Majesty engages to continue to assist, to the utmost of his power, the Spanish nation in their struggle against the tyranny and usurpation of France, and promises not to acknowledge any other King of Spain and of the Indies thereunto appertaining, than his Catholic Majesty Ferdinand VII. his heirs, or such lawful successor as the Spanish Nation shall acknowledge ; and the Spanish Government, in the name and on the behalf of his Catholic Majesty Ferdinand VII. engages never, in any case, to cede to France any part of the territories or possessions of the Spanish Monarchy, in any part of the world. 4. The High Contracting Parties agree to make common cause against France ; and not to make peace with that Power except by common consent. 5. The present Treaty shall be ratified by both parties, and the exchange of the ratifications shall be made in the space of two months (or sooner if it can be done), in London.—In witness whereof, we, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, have signed, in virtue of our respective full powers, the present Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Alliance, and have sealed it with the seals of our arms. (L. S.) GEORGE CANNING, (L. S.) JUAN RUIZ DE APODACA.

Article I. Separate.—The Spanish Government engages to take the most effectual measures for the preventing of the Spanish squadrons in all the Ports of Spain, as well as of the French squadron,

taken in the month of June, and now in the harbour of Cadiz, from falling into the power of France. For which purpose his Britannic Majesty engages to co-operate by all means in his power.—The present separate Article shall have the same force and validity, as if it were inserted, word for word, in the Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Alliance signed this day, and shall be ratified at the same time.—In witness whereof, We, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, have signed, &c. &c. (L. S.) GEORGE CANNING. (L. S.) JUAN RUIZ DE APODACA.

Article II. Separate.—A Treaty shall forthwith be negotiated, stipulating the amount and description of succours to be afforded by his Britannic Majesty, agreeably to the third Article of the present Treaty.—The present separate Article shall have the same force and validity, as if it were inserted, word for word, in the Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Alliance, signed this day, and shall be ratified at the same time.—In witness whereof, we, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, have signed, &c. (L. S.) GEORGE CANNING.

(L. S.) JUAN RUIZ DE APODACA.

Additional Article.—The present circumstances not admitting of the regular negotiation of a Treaty of Commerce between the two countries, with all the care and consideration due to so important a subject, the High Contracting Parties mutually engage to proceed to such negotiation as soon as it shall be practicable so to do, affording in the mean time, mutual facilities to the commerce of the subjects of each other, by temporary regulations founded on principles of reciprocal utility.—The present additional Articles shall have the same force and validity, &c. &c. (L. S.) GEORGE CANNING.

(L. S.) JUAN RUIZ DE APODACA.

#### REVOLUTION IN SWEDEN.

We have to record another political Revolution. The king of Sweden has been deposed by his subjects; and his uncle, the duke of Sudermania, has assumed the Government of the Country as Regent. The Revolution took place on the 13th of March. The King was arrested as he was about to depart for his country residence; and when the last advices came away, he was a close prisoner at Stockholm. When his Majesty was first surrounded by a guard, he drew his sword, but was soon overpowered, and prevented from making resistance. When the person of the King

was secured, the following Proclamation was issued:

*Proclamation issued by the Duke of Sudermania on his assuming the Government.*

"We Charles, by the grace of God, hereditary prince of Sweden, the Goths, Vandals, &c. duke of Sudermania, grand admiral, &c. &c. do declare, That, under existing circumstances, his majesty is incapable to act, or to conduct the important affairs of the Nation: We have, therefore, (being the nearest and only branch of the family of age), been induced for the time being, as Administrator of the Kingdom, to take the reins of Government into our hands, which, with the help of the Almighty, we will conduct, so that the Nation may regain Peace, both at home and abroad, and that Trade and Commerce may revive from their languishing state.—Our inviolable intention is, to consult with the States on the means to be taken to render the future time happy to the People of Sweden. We invite and command, therefore, all the Inhabitants of our Nation, our Forces by Sea and Land, and also the civil officers of all degrees, to obey us, as our real intention, and their own welfare demand.—We recommend you all to the protection of God Almighty.—Done at Stockholm Palace, the 13th of March, 1809.—

(Signed) CHARLES.—C. LAGERBRING."

CARLSDAKT, March 10.—An alarming occurrence took place here within these last few days: colonel d'Addesparre, who commanded the troops on the frontiers of Norway, after having seduced them, marched in here on the night of the 6th inst. and demanded of the Burgomaster quarters for his troops, which was refused; in consequence of which, he made application to count Rosen, the governor, stating, that if his request was not granted, the troops he commanded should enforce it, and take quarters wherever they could find them. Count Rosen still persisting in the refusal, he was ordered under arrest, as was the Burgomaster; and the troops forcibly obtained what their leader had demanded. Colonel d'Addesparre, at the head of 2,000 regular troops, and about the same number of peasantry, are now on their march to Stockholm, to demand of the King to call a Diet of the States, as well as to obtain payment of the troops under his command.

*Proclamation of the Commander of the Troops stationed in Weinland.*

A considerable number of soldiers have taken up arms, in order to march

to the capital, and relieve our common, now unfortunate, and dismembered native country.—As all our fellow-citizens must be sensible that our views are such as public spirit and honour dictate to virtuous minds, we cannot be mistaken in our implicit confidence, that our brethren in arms and our unarmed fellow-citizens, will not form any incorrect opinion of our sentiments and views. They are merely these, that the States of the realm and our Legislators shall be at liberty to assemble and deliberate uncontroled on the means of restoring the prosperity of our suffering country.—We have solemnly contracted the engagement to lay at their feet the arms which we have taken up to procure them freedom. We will form a wall round the hall where Swedish Legislators hold their deliberations, which no power upon earth shall be able to beat down. We have solemnly contracted the engagement to destroy all such as shall still endeavour to prefer foreign connections to the internal welfare and tranquillity of Sweden.—Sweden's German dominions are delivered up to the enemy, and Finland, the native soil of a noble and gallant people, is lost. We have solemnly contracted the engagement, that not a single inch more of the Swedish territory shall be given up to the enemy. Sweden's trade and mines are ruined and deserted; Sweden's youth are taken from agricultural pursuits, in order to be destroyed by sickness and the sword. The burthens laid on Agriculture are such that they cannot be borne any longer. Grinding taxes are exacted without mercy; desolation and misery are spreading wide and far, and threaten universal ruin.—We have contracted the solemn engagement, that the fathers of the country shall enjoy full liberty to restore the welfare and prosperity of the country.—May the higher and lower States of the common weal also join heart and hand to assert the freedom of the country, and thus, by harmony and well-concerted efforts, ensure success to our enterprize and views.—May the Fathers of the Country offer peace and amity to our neighbours, but accompany this offer with the assurance that every Swedish hero will rather be buried under the ruins of his country,

than suffer a single inch of Swedish ground to be taken by our enemies, or transferred to them.—Our Ally, Great Britain, shall learn to appreciate and value a nation, which knows how to break its fetters, and rescue liberty from its chains; France shall learn to respect a people, anxious to rival her military prowess; the rulers of Russia and Denmark, incessantly engaged in pursuits tending to promote the prosperity of their people, will not disturb the peace and tranquillity of a nation which merely desires to live or die independent.—We have seen with sorrow the most important concerns of Sweden managed in a manner which was as destitute of any well conceived plan as of success.—Might not the remaining strength of Sweden have been wasted by folly? but if directed by wisdom, may it not be employed for the real benefit of the country? Such are our wishes for our country, and we shall readily sacrifice our lives to obtain their fulfilment. It is of the utmost importance for Sweden, that every Swede should at length be allowed to return to a peaceful home, as far as it can be done without any disparagement to the honour and independence of Sweden.—The frontiers of the kingdom are for a short time left without defence, on account of our departure from thence; but should the enemy, contrary to his solemn promise, avail himself of our absence to attack them, we shall speedily return, take a severe revenge, and convince him of the difference of a warfare carried on by personal hatred of the rulers, and a war urged by a nation, anxious and determined to assert its independence.—We implicitly confide, that all military Commanders will readily co-operate with us, to secure, by speedy and vigorous exertion, the restoration of our lost prosperity, in the destruction of our foreign foes.—To conclude, we venture to express the wish, that our beloved countrymen and fellow-citizens of every rank and description may suspend their judgment on all further proceedings, until the decision of the States of the realm shall be known.

(Signed)

The Commander of the Troops  
stationed in Weimland."

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 14.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 8, 1809.

[Price 1s.

In the year 1802, PHILIP HAMLIN, a Tinman of Plymouth, wrote a letter to Mr. HENRY ADDINGTON, the first Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, offering him the sum of £2,000 to give him, HAMLIN, the place of Land-Surveyor of the Customs at Plymouth.—In consequence of this, a criminal information was filed, against the said HAMLIN, by MR. SPENCER PERCEVAL, who was then the King's Attorney-General, and who, in pleading against the offender, asserted the distinguished purity of persons in power, in the present day. From the Bench great stress was laid on the gravity of the offence of tendering a bribe; of the baneful tendency of such crimes, in a moral as well as in a political point of view. The Tinman was found guilty; he was sentenced to pay a fine of 100 pounds to the King, and to be imprisoned for three months. His business was ruined; and he himself died, in a few months after his release from prison.—POLITICAL REGISTER, Vol. II. page 1621\*.

513] [514

## SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

REFORM.—Under this head I shall introduce, from time to time, such matter as appears to me to be connected with the great question of *Parliamentary Reformation*, which question is, I perceive, to be brought forward for discussion, in the House of Commons, at no great distance of time. I shall also bring under this head many matters of Abuse and Corruption; and, indeed, every thing, which shall appear to me well calculated to shew, that a reform of the Commons' House of Parliament is necessary.—For reminding me of the little pitiful history, contained in my motto, I have to thank the Editor of an excellent Sunday Paper, called THE EXAMINER. To be sure, this history is admirably calculated for producing good impressions, at the present time. Here we see what was done to the tenderer of a bribe, in 1802. It is only seven years ago. Let us now hear, a little of what was said upon that occasion by MR. PERCEVAL and by the JUDGE.—Poor Hamlin confessed his guilt; he stated, in his affidavit, "that he sincerely repented "of his crime; that he was 40 years of "age; that his business was the sole "means of supporting himself and family; "that a severe judgment might be the "total ruin of himself and that family; "and that, therefore, he threw himself "upon, and implored, the mercy of his "prosecutors and of the Court."—In reference to this, Mr. Perceval, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, observe, said: "The circumstances which the defendant discloses, respecting his own situation in life and of his family are all of them topics, very well adapted to affect the private feelings of individuals, and, as far as that consideration goes, nothing further need be said; but, there would have been no prosecution at all, in this case, upon the ground of personal feeling;

"it was set on foot upon grounds of a "public nature, and the spirit, in which "the prosecution originated, still remains; "it is, therefore, submitted to your lord- "ships, not on a point of individual feel- "ing, but of PUBLIC JUSTICE, in which "case your lordships will consider how "far the affidavits ought to operate in mi- "tigation of punishment."—Public justice! Public justice! Public justice! Public justice! Oh! Public justice!—Well; what said the Judge? What said MR. JUSTICE GROSE, in passing sentence upon this man; "Such a practice, if per- "mitted, would lead to mischief incalcula- "ble; for, it might extend to every office "in the appointment of the great ministers "of the state, civil, MILITARY, and ecclesi- "astical, and would supersede men of ability "and integrity, and place, in their stead, "the ignorant and corrupt."—Very sound doctrine, most excellent doctrine!—How the Revd. Mr. Beazley will be dealt with it remains to be seen; and we will wait for the event; though I cannot help stopping here, for a moment, to point out to my readers the valuable fact, that this was a *political writer*, as well as a priest; and that, besides the tendered bribe, he urged his merits as being the author of a pamphlet (another dirty pamphlet), in favour of the ministry of the day.—But, while we bear in mind the affair of the Rev. Mr. Beazley, are there wanting cases, which have come before the parliament, whereunto to apply the principles of pub- "lic justice," upon which poor Hamlin was sentenced to fine and imprisonment? Are there wanting cases of tendered bribes? Are there wanting cases of bribes *actually given*, and answered in value received? Are there no persons, who have been proved to hold offices in consequence of such bribes? And have any measures been taken to punish any of those persons?

Reader, if thou be'st a man ; if thou hast one particle of *justice* in thy soul ; thou wilt answer these questions, without any assistance of mine ; and wilt not fail to furnish, out of thine own mind, a suitable commentary. — Upon the Trial of poor Hamlin, *Mr. Perceval* said : “ My lords, I think it is due to the age and country, in which we live, to state, what, indeed, is *universally believed*, that there never was a period, in the history of this country, or of any other, in which the characters of persons, in an exalted station of public life, were so free from all suspicion of this species of offence, as at the present moment.” — Reader, this was said by a man, who was then one of those persons in exalted stations ; who is now Chancellor of the Exchequer ; to whom Mr. Adam sent Digby Hamilton about the Note in Sandon’s possession ; who, in conjunction with Mr. Adam, charged Digby to enjoin Sandon *not to destroy* that Note ; who, when he had been told that Sandon had destroyed the Note, did, in conjunction with Mr. Adam, communicate a knowledge of it to some members of the House of Commons ; and, who, when the Note was, afterwards, found to be still in existence, did speak of it as a *forgery* of Mrs. Clarke. But, what is most of all worthy of remark, is, that it has fallen to the lot of this very man to bring into the House of Commons a bill, a bill ! aye, a law, to put a stop, under a government in which he is the prime minister, to those very practices, the rarity of which he insisted upon, in 1802, and for having attempted a single instance of which he called for “ PUBLIC JUSTICE ” upon the head of Hamlin the Tinman ! Oh ! Englishmen, if you fail to draw the proper, the practical, the profitable conclusion from these premises, then are you indeed besotted ; then will you indeed deserve to be treated with disregard and contempt beyond those which are shown towards the beasts that perish. — The reader will have observed, that, during the recent inquiry, the persons, who took the side of the Duke of York, seemed very much alive to the feelings of the parties accused. One complained of harrowing up the soul of the Duke ; another of wounding the honour of Colonel French ; another of tarnishing the fame of the families of those, who were charged with bribery ; one spoke of the honour of General Clavering, even after he had confessed his offer of a bribe ; and, Mr. Robert Knight, after he had himself proved his having given a bribe, was,

by one member, represented as a gentleman of honour, who once had a seat in that House. “ Public Justice,” that public justice, which was demanded against Hamlin, in answer to his humble prayer for mercy, none of these gentlemen called for ; that public justice, before which Hamlin and his family could not stand for a moment. Even now we see the bribers at large ; nay, we see them in quiet possession of their offices. True, the frequency of the thing ; the having witnessed a continued succession of advertisements, respecting the purchase and sale of offices under government, and also of seats in parliament, does form some little, though very little apology for Knight, French, Sandon, Tonyn, Dowler, and the rest of the bribing crew ; but, had not poor Hamlin the same apology ? Was not the same excuse good for the preservation of him and his family ? Hamlin was fined ; Hamlin was sentenced to pay a fine of 100 pounds to the King ; and was imprisoned for three months. Think of this, all you, who love even-handed justice. Think of this ; bear it in memory till your last moments ; and imprint it on the minds of your children. No “ private feelings ” were to stay the hand of “ public justice,” in the case of Philip Hamlin. The ruin of his business and family was not to stop the even course of public justice. Oh ! bear this in mind, and hope and labour for the day when the remembrance of it may be of practical advantage ! — In my last Number, I had the pleasing task of recording the Resolutions passed at the Meeting, held in the City of Westminster ; and, in my present, I shall insert, entire, the speech of Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, delivered upon that occasion, which speech I take as I find it reported in the Courier news-paper, and I select that paper to copy from, because it is, in general, a supporter of the present administration. But, if my pleasure was great in inserting an account of the Proceedings at Westminster, how shall I describe that which I feel at inserting an account of the proceedings in the City of London, where a spectacle has been exhibited, cheering to the hearts of all those who love their country, and terrible to nobody but its foreign and domestic foes. — At a Common Hall ; that is to say, an assemblage of the Livery of the City of London, which was held on Saturday last, the 1st of April, the following excellent Resolutions were moved by Mr. WAITHMAN, and were unanimously passed ; and,

it will be seen, that the hope I expressed was not groundless, namely, that the *conduct of the Lord Mayor* would not be forgotten.—I shall take the Resolutions, just as they stand, published by authority, in the news-papers; because this is a very memorable transaction, and will hereafter be a matter of frequent reference, for which reason I shall *number* the Resolutions.

#### FLOWER, MAYOR.

In a Meeting or Assembly of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Liverymen, of the several Companies of the City of London, in Common Hall Assembled, at the Guildhall of the said City, on Saturday, the 1st day of April, 1809,

#### RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY,

1. THAT it has long been matter of notoriety, and has lately been proved, beyond the possibility of doubt, that Abuses of a most corrupt nature and ruinous tendency have existed and still exist in various branches of the Administration of Public Affairs.

2. Resolved Unanimously—That to detect such Abuses, and expose to detestation those men who have wickedly contrived at or participated in them, requires no small degree of virtue, independence and patriotism, all which have been eminently displayed by Gwyllym Lloyd Wardle, Esq. in instituting and conducting the late Inquiry into the conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York.

3. Resolved Unanimously—That the said Gwyllym Lloyd Wardle, Esq. is therefore entitled to the Thanks and Gratitude of this Common Hall, for his persevering and independent efforts, which have already produced beneficial effects, and are likely to lead to still more advantageous results; and they express their confidence that having so manfully and ably commenced this arduous task, no difficulty or danger will damp his ardour or impede his progress in a cause so honourable to himself and so essential to the best interests of his country.

4. Resolved Unanimously—That upon the same principles, and for the same reasons, they do highly approve of the conduct of Sir Francis Burdett, Bart. (the Seconder) Lord Viscount Folkestone, Samuel Whitbread, Esq. Sir Samuel Romilly, Knight, General Fergusson, and the rest of the 125 honest and independent Members, who supported Mr. Wardle's proposition on the 15th of March, 1809, and trust that, uninfluenced by party or feelings of interest, they will support every

measure calculated to remove abuses and root out corruption.

5. Resolved Unanimously—That these Abuses form only a part of a wicked and corrupt System, which has been long acted upon, and no permanent good can arise from the late investigation, unless followed up by a general reformation of Public Abuses in every department of the State.

6. Resolved Unanimously—That the Corporation of London did, in Petitions unanimously agreed to, and presented to both Houses of Parliament, during the last Sessions, state, “ That their burthens had been considerably augmented by gross abuses in the management and expenditure of the Public Money, by a profusion of Sinecure Places and Pensions, which have not only added to the sufferings of the people, but created a pernicious influence, corrupting and undermining the free principles of the British Constitution.”

7. Resolved Unanimously—That no measures calculated to remove these oppressive and alarming evils have yet been adopted, nor can any rational expectation be formed that such measures will be adopted, while the management of the Public Affairs is in the hands of persons who are themselves the greatest Pensioners and Reversionists in the kingdom.

8. Resolved Unanimously—That it has since appeared, by the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons, that 78 Members of that House are in the receipt of £.178,994 per annum, out of the Public Money, who, with their relations, and the Naval and Military Officers in that House, must give a most preponderating and dangerous influence to a Ministers of the Crown.

9. Resolved Unanimously—That if any doubt could remain as to the baneful effect of such influence, it has been sufficiently exemplified by the rejection of Mr. Wardle's late Proposition in Parliament, against the most conclusive evidence, and unequivocal sense of the country; and where it appeared that all his Majesty's Ministers—all the Placemen—and all the Pensioners, then present (stated to be 82 in number) voted against the said Proposition; while, of course, in the Minority of 125, not one of the Ministers—not one Placeman—not one Pensioner—and only one Naval and one Military Commander was to be found.

10. Resolved Unanimously—That other Governments have crumbled into ruin—other States have been subverted, and their ancient and venerable Institutions overthrown, by the folly, profligacy, and vice

of their Rulers; and, in the opinion of this Common Hall, unless this overwhelming tide of corruption is resisted by temperate and timely reformation, it must inevitably lead to the ruin and subjugation of this Country.

11. Resolved Unanimously — That it will be highly expedient for the Livery of London, some time during the present Session, to meet for the purpose of laying a faithful statement of their Grievances before Parliament, and pray for redress of the same.

12. Resolved Unanimously — That the Thanks of this Common Hall be given to Alderman Combe, one of the Representatives of this City in Parliament, for the support he gave to Mr. Wardle's Motion, and for his uniform independence and incorruptibility in Parliament.

13. Resolved — That Sir William Curtis, Bart. Sir Charles Price, Bart. and James Shaw, Esq. three of the Representatives for this City in Parliament have, by their recent conduct therein, shewn a contempt and disregard for the opinions and interests of their Constituents, and a base subserviency to the will of Ministers; and are, therefore, unworthy the confidence of their Fellow-Citizens.

14. Resolved — That the Lord Mayor has, by refusing to convene a Common Hall upon the three different requisitions, by presuming to dictate the terms and object of the present requisition, by the reluctance he even afterwards evinced, and the trouble and delay he has created, shewn a contempt and disregard for the Rights and Privileges of the Livery, and is unworthy the confidence of his Fellow-Citizens.

15. Resolved — That the Thanks of this Common Hall be given to Robert Waithman, Esq. for his manly conduct in the present instance, and his unremitting zeal upon all occasions where the Interests of his Fellow-Citizens are in Question.

16. Resolved Unanimously — That the foregoing Resolutions be signed by the Town Clerk, and inserted in all the Morning and Evening Papers. WOODTHORPE.

I would fain give all the speeches, delivered upon this occasion, and especially the two speeches of Mr. Waithman; but my space will not allow of it. One speech, however, I cannot refrain from giving; and that is the speech of Mr. Alderman CURTIS, who is also a member of parliament. "Sir William Curtis next appeared. Immediately a tumult, which we would vainly attempt to describe, arose. One

"universal hiss echoed through the hall. "Sir William addressed them in dumb shew, he bowed, put his hand upon his heart, all in vain. The Lord Mayor thought to conciliate, but he was obliged to retire amid universal groanings, hissing, &c. Sir Wm. at length gained a partial hearing; he said the resolutions went to charge Government with corruption.—(*Shouts of Yes, yes! and you along with them.*)—Why, said Sir William, "I believe many of those connected with the Duke of York to have been corrupt, but Gentlemen in the House of Commons spoke three or four hours each, and if every one was to do that, we should be sitting still. I then only spoke a few words. Cries of 'they would not hear you.'—" Your vote?"—"How did you vote?" Indeed, Gentlemen, there was such confusion I did not know how to vote; many did not know how they voted (hissing). I assure you I am no Place-man, no Pensioner. (*Rows of derision; You are, you are,' 'A Jobber, a Contractor, shame, shame, off, off!*) Sir Wm. made a low bow and took his seat beside the Lord Mayor."—The "worthy Alderman" was not less unfortunate than his two colleagues, SIR CHARLES PRICE and MR. ALDERMAN SHAW, the former of whom, when he came to speak of having given his vote according to the "*best of his judgment,*" excited such general hisses and cries of *off! off!* that the "Honourable Baronet" was compelled to retire.—MR. ALDERMAN SHAW seems to have proceeded for a while without interruption, until he came to these words: "For my own part, I can safely declare, that I judged of the Duke of York, as I should have done of any other Englishman, upon the same evidence," when, as the reporter states, *a certain monosyllable*, accompanied by *off! off!* proceeded from numerous voices.—Now came the close, the excellent close of this novel and heart-cheering scene. The resolution of censure against Messrs. PRICE, SHAW and CURTIS having been carried with about only a dozen dissenting voices, MR. WAITHMAN came forward and proposed the resolution of censure with respect to the conduct of the Lord Mayor, who was himself in the chair, and whose duty it was, of course, *to put the resolution.* "The Noble Lord," as the news-papers call him, appears to have boggled a good deal; he expostulated; and, amidst hisses and hooting and laughing, expressed his resolution not to put the resolution. Mr. Waithman insisted, that he could not refuse. Mr.

Rowcroft stepped forward in favour of "the Noble Lord," but, when his object became apparent, he was assailed by cries of—"You are his partner and adviser, "and ought to justify your own acts. You "are his *brother contractor*. You have in- "volved him in the hobble, and may try "to release him. We understand you "both, and the public will know you "soon."—After some further altercation; but not until MR. ALDERMAN COMBE had expressed his determination to take the chair and put the resolution, if the Lord Mayor would not, the Noble Lord came forward, and said, that, not from his own conviction, but for the sake of the *peace of the City*, he would put the resolution himself, which he actually did, and, with his own lips, proclaimed, that the Resolution of censure of his own conduct had been carried!—The thanks of the Livery were then given to MR. WAITHMAN; and if ever man living, or dead, deserved such a mark of approbation, Mr. Waithman deserved it. Twenty years has he been labouring to unglue the eyes of the Citizens of London. No difficulties; no discouragements; no calumnies have slackened his efforts. He has always said: "they are "blinded; they are misled; they are "deceived, cheated by cunning knaves; "but, still there is good in their hearts, "and one day or other, it will appear." I remember his saying this to me, about thirteen or fourteen months ago. The beauty of it is, too, that he is a man of excellent character, in every respect; that he is a plain unambitious man; that he is perfectly disinterested in all he does; that he is a real patriot, and as faithful and zealous a subject as any the King has in his whole dominions. Oh! the loads of abuse that most worthy man has had to sustain! The public have recently witnessed the effects of his zeal and activity, with regard to Christ's Hospital. Having brought forward a shocking instance of abuse there, the *Reverend* person accused does not, for he cannot, *deny the charge*; but he fails not to accuse Mr. Waithman of being *an enemy to the civil and religious establishments of the country!* This school was endowed for the purpose of affording the *poor men* of England an opportunity of elevating their families by the education of their children. It is required, that the father, or other guardian of the child, should make and sign a declaration, I believe, *on oath* (though I will not be quite sure of that) that the child, proposed to be put into the school, is of

such an age, &c. that he was born thus and thus; and, that the father or mother, or child himself, if an orphan, *has not the means of paying himself for the education of the child.* Now, it appears, that the REV. DAWSON WARREN (let us have his name as we can read it), Vicar of Edmonton, in Middlesex, whose son was got into the school, admits that his income is £.550 a year, and that his life is insured for £.3,000.—Can there be a more crying abuse than this? Nay, and when a motion was made for the expulsion of the boy, it was urged, as a reason against the adoption of the motion, "that it might "establish a dangerous precedent, which "might lead to the expulsion of half the "school." Yet, by exposing this shocking abuse; this wrong shamefully done to our poorer countrymen, and that, too, by one of the most richly beneficed clergymen; by exposing this abuse, and by persevering, as he does in every thing he undertakes, Mr. Waithman called down upon his head the charge of being an enemy to the *civil and religious establishments* of the kingdom.—It has been uniformly thus: reason upon abuses, and you are answered by a charge of jacobinism: state facts, and you are a traitor. If there be no construction of law that will reach you, recourse is had to calumny; meet that and defeat it, and recourse is had to cowardly insinuation. All the vices, all the weaknesses, all that is defective in the people is armed against you. Prejudices are created and nourished, with a degree of care and of malignant perseverance hardly to be conceived; and thus the triumph of falsehood over truth is insured. For twenty years has Mr. Waithman been struggling against this torrent of overwhelming corruption and falsehood. Truth, however, has, at last, forced her way, *thanks to Mr. Wardle*, through all the obstacles that existed, and on Saturday last, Mr. Waithman received ample compensation for half a life of anxiety and of labour.—Now, then, will Mr. Yorke and Mr. Perceval say, that this is mere "*popular clamour?*" That it is not the voice, the sober sense, of the people? True, the Livery of London did hiss, and cry *off! off!* But, this was an expression of their indignation at conduct, upon which they had all the means of forming a cool and correct opinion. If, indeed, it had been now that the subject had been *first* discussed, the case would be different; we should then say, that they ought to have listened patiently to both sides; but, the whole of the evidence, in

minute detail, had been before them for a month; each man of them had had ample time and opportunity to form his judgment; the conviction had been produced, and all that remained to be done was to pass sentence. That sentence they have passed; and, I trust, the whole nation is ready to follow their example.—It was one of those cases, upon which it was *impossible*; quite and completely impossible, for any man, in his right senses, to form a wrong opinion. It was a matter which admitted not of dispute, or of difference of opinion, any more than does the existence of man. There required, therefore, no discussion. It was a mere dry question of degree of indignation; and, all the use of a speech, even from Mr. Waithman, was to settle that question of degree. I find, therefore, nothing to complain of in the impatience of the Livery, nor in the manner of expressing their resentment. I think they have shewn themselves to be animated by a spirit, such as the times require, and such as, I hope and trust, will be communicated to the kingdom at large.

I rejoice to see, that they despise the idea of hoping for any salutary effects from what has been done, unless it be followed by a *general reform*, and especially a reform of the Commons House of Parliament. Why have we now all these meetings? Why do we feel ourselves called upon to thank Mr. Wardle? Because we see, that it is necessary to give him *support*. Support *against whom*? Against whom does he want support? Why, against those, who voted against him. Against those, who are pointed out in the City Resolutions. This it is, and this alone, which has thrown the nation into such a ferment, which, one would think, would be quite sufficient to convince even the most blinded and the most interested of the absolute necessity of a legal, constitutional, and temperate reform. There is no *innovation* wanted. Lay the books of the constitution of England open, and give us what they describe, and no more, and we shall be perfectly satisfied. Here is the whole nation in movement to give thanks, to present pieces of plate, to erect monuments, to a member of parliament. And, for what? Why, for doing no more than what it is the bounden duty of every member of the House of Commons to do. What must be the conclusion from this? That no one but him would have done what he has done; or, at least, that the fidelity to public trust, and zeal in the public service, which he has shewn, are

extremely rare; are almost the singular exception, instead of being the general rule.—It is evident, as Mr. Waithman told the Livery, that, if this reform, so necessary to the stability of the throne, as well as to the happiness of the people, is to be brought about, it must be in consequence of the exertions of the people, made in a manner at once legal, constitutional, respectful, and determined. There is no occasion for *Clubs* or *Associations* of any sort. The law, even as it now stands, gives us full scope for our exertions in this way, and, if we do not avail ourselves of it, all that we now complain of is infinitely too good for us.

**SPAIN and SWEDEN.**—In the midst of our inquiries at home, we have, and very wisely too, laid aside all discussion about the affairs of Spain, though our ministers have recently made a Treaty of Alliance with king FERDINAND VII, whom Napoleon has living upon a pension, or at board wages, in France! They may make treaties of alliance; they may make new ambassadors, and they may fasten those new ambassadors on us for life, though the list is already quite long enough; but, they will do nothing for the restoration of the Bourbons in Spain. I told them what the consequence of royalizing the cause of Spain would be. They did royalize it, and that consequence has followed.—The public will bear in mind, that I was outrageously abused for saying, that the people of Spain would not fight for Ferdinand; for saying, that they would stand by, spectators without interest in the event; that nothing that we could do would induce them to make sacrifices for the re-establishment of the old corrupt system, the old system of corruption. For having said this, for beseeching my readers not to believe anything they heard about the enthusiasm of the Spaniards, I was called a jacobin; was charged with wishing to overturn the government of England; and was, by the base hirelings of the day, represented as being the *immediate agent of the devil*. Well, now, what says Sir JOHN MOORE, who was in Spain, at the very time that I was thus reviled? What says he, in his dispatches to the government? Why, he says, that so far from meeting with a people enthusiastic in the cause of king Ferdinand; so far from this, that he found, at the best, an indifference towards that cause; that he could obtain no aid from the people of any sort; no co-operation, no concurrence, no sympathy; and that he could not even get intelligence of events

at fifty miles distance from him, so completely were the people wanting in all friendly feeling towards him, his army, and his cause. He says, and it should be well remembered, that the difficulty of his situation is greatly increased in consequence of the *wifounded expectations raised at home by representing the Spanish people as unanimously enthusiastic in the cause.* He states this embarrassment most distinctly. He expresses, in a most feeling manner, his fear of disappointing those sanguine, though groundless expectations; and, indeed, the tenor of his dispatches clearly shows, that his delay to retreat; and that all his and the army's misfortunes, arose primarily from this false expectation, excited at home. This was the fruit of all the silly bragging in our public prints; of the still more silly toasts of the Turtle patriots; and of that expression, which I need not attempt to qualify, “*the Universal Spanish nation,*” the like of which was never before found in any writing above the level of a romance. “*The universal Spanish nation!*” Where was it when our army got there? Where was it when the French entered Madrid? Go ask; Mr. Canning, go ask the graves of the thousands of Englishmen, who perished in that ill-fated expedition; go seek, in the history of slaughtered horses and of money chests emptied into wells and from the tops of mountains; go ask the dispersed, the shattered, the emaciated, the beggar-looking remains of the army: this is where you are to ask, what had become of “*the universal Spanish nation,*” fired, as it was, with enthusiasm in the cause of FERDINAND VII. The remains of that army will tell you, that, as an *earnest* of this enthusiasm, our transports, upon arriving at Corunna, were delayed for some time for want of pilots, who, at last, were obtained only in consequence of more than double the usual pay;—that, upon landing, every thing necessary for the accommodation or the movement of the army was obliged to be purchased at an enormous price, and that it became, even from the first, necessary to collect forage with the dollars in one hand and the sword in the other, so reluctant were the “universal Spanish nation” even to *sell* comfort to their “deliverers;”—that, as the army proceeded up the country, they found this disinclination towards them increase;—that, in order to obtain, even at very exorbitant prices, what was absolutely necessary to the existence of the horses, they were, almost constantly, obliged to have

recourse to compulsory measures;—that, every where, they were received with lurking hostility, or, at the very best, with the coldest of coldness;—that, upon no occasion, did the people shew the smallest degree of compassion for the sick or the wounded, but, on the contrary, treated them, where they had an opportunity, with every species of contempt and cruelty;—that “*the universal Spanish nation,*” as far as our army had an opportunity of viewing its conduct, was, however, perfectly impartial in this respect, treating the poor wretches, who returned from BLAKE’s army, in exactly the same manner;—that, when our troops entered LUGO, some horse-men going into a stable, in the dark, trod upon dead bodies, which they afterwards found to be some of the poor creatures before-mentioned, who had been driven from the doors of the inhabitants, and left to perish with pain and hunger;—that many of these men, actually died, and laid dead, in the streets, for want of warmth and sustenance, while, at the same time, the merciless priests, with their tribes of chanters and torch-bearers, were, along those same streets, marching in solemn procession, the people, this part of “*the universal Spanish nation,*” being, all the while, prostrate in the dirt or snow, in sign of adoration and piety, in sign of attachment to those “altars,” for which Mr. Alderman Birch told us it was a virtue to fight and to die;—that, as to the state of the people, instead of seeing that bustle, that industry, and that cheerfulness, to be witnessed in an English town, you saw all the doors close shut and fast bolted, the windows scarcely open, nothing having the appearance of business, and the people either kneeling down in the streets at the tinkling or ringing of a bell, or shrugged up, their heads buried in their cloaks, leaning against the walls;—that, amongst this part, at least, of “*the universal Spanish nation,*” there is nothing answering to that term, in which all manner of happiness is conveyed, namely, *a fire-side*, there being not even any *fire-places*, except one for culinary purposes, and even there the smoke is generally left to find its way out of the doors, or through the roof;—that, to such a pitch are priest-craft and popular credulity supported, that it is the custom, when a poor person dies, to deposit the body in a coffin, with the lid off, to cover the body with thin crape, leaving the arms and head bare, to deposit it, in this state, in a capacious niche, by the

side of the most public walk of the town, placing a picture upon the wall, representing a person burning in hell, and holding up his hands to angels, who seem waiting for authority to rescue the sufferer, to place a money box under the picture, and, when that box is filled to the satisfaction of the priests, the body is buried ; — that the priests are seen almost constantly prowling about with their torches, their hosts, and their benedictions, never forgetting a *money box* ; — that the situation of the labouring people is miserable in the extreme, they having no furniture, no beds but the earth and straw or rushes, and their cookery consisting chiefly of the boiling of chesnuts and roots in a sort of pipkins, or mugs, made of clay ; — that his part, at least, of “the universal Spanish nation,” are, as of course they must be, a filthy, meagre, and squalid race, while the priests are stout and jolly fellows, straight in shape and rosy in complexion — It is very fine to talk about “*altars*.” Such words do very well for the rounding of a sentence ; but, I put it to the good sense and to the real piety of any man, whether it be desirable that any people should exist in such a situation ? The ministers have said, that it was not for them to *find fault* with the system of either the Church or State in Spain. Certainly not ; but, it is one thing to find fault with, and interfere in, the internal government of Spain, and another to *give your support to that government* ; and that, too, at such an immense expence of lives as well as of money to your own country. It is one thing to call upon Spain to reform the abuses of which I have been speaking, and another thing to send an army to assist her rulers in upholding and perpetuating those horrible abuses, abuses not more injurious and degrading to man than they are blasphemous against his Maker. This nation, the ministers have told us, were unanimous in their enthusiasm in the cause of Spain. So they were ; but, was not that enthusiasm bottomed upon the belief, that the Spaniards were fighting for *freedom* ? Or, is there really to be found a man of impudence sufficient to assert, that the people of England were eager to give their money and to shed their blood for the support of a state of things, in which the hell-fire niche and money-box formed a principal feature ? — Let us leave, however, the morality of the thing aside, and consider our measures, with respect to Spain, merely as to their *policy*, and let us suppose that policy to be confined to the

preventing of Napoleon from becoming master of Spain. For my part, I despise such a motive of warfare ; but, suppose it to be laudable, suppose this to have been a wise and just motive for our taking part in the war ; and then, upon that supposition, I ask the reader, whether he thinks that it is *probable* ; whether he thinks that it is *possible*, for a people, situated as the people of Spain are, to be roused to any thing like popular enthusiasm or public spirit, without being *first enlightened* as to the abuses practised upon them ; without being *first let loose* from the chains with which they are bound ? The answer of common sense is in the negative. — The ministers had deputies enough in Spain. We hear, every day, of their information from Sir Such-an-one and Lord Such-an-one and His Excellency John Illokham Frere ; but, there needed none of this ; to men, not blinded by their hatred of “jacobinism,” and by their eagerness to be *a-doing*, there needed no more than a very ordinary portion of general knowledge, joined to a very moderate capacity of judging of the power of causes in producing effects ; there needed these only to convince our ministers, that, to resist Napoleon in Spain, with the smallest chance of ultimate success, a revolution, a complete and radical revolution, a total change in the government, church as well as state, must *first* be accomplished. It was not for them to *dictate* to the Spaniards, to tell them what sort of government they ought to have, or what part of their old system they ought to destroy ; but, it was for them, it was their bounden duty, to ascertain that the people of Spain were in a state, calculated to afford them a chance of success, before so much English money and blood, and so much English reputation was hazarded, in attempts to assist the Spaniards. This they did not ascertain ; upon this subject, which was important above all others connected with the affairs of Spain, Sir John Moore’s dispatches prove, that the English nation was completely misled ; and the public will remember, that they were so misled by publications, *official* as well as others, issuing from the ministry, who, from the very outset, appear to have had uppermost in their thoughts the preventing of a popular revolution in Spain, *lest the example of Spain should become contagious*. — As to the *military measures* ; as to the more or less of the probability of that misfortune and disgrace, which attended our flight through Leon and Galicia, they are nothing at all ; though great in themselves,

they are as nothing, when put in comparison with the *principle of the war*. It is to this principle that the people of England should look as to the cause, and the only cause, of all the sufferings of the army, and all the losses of the country in this war; and, I am persuaded, that there is no man, who gives the matter a serious and impartial consideration, who will not agree with me, that all those sufferings and all those losses are to be fairly ascribed to the reluctance of our ministers to see a free government established in Spain. They seem clearly to me to have thought, that a radical reformation in Spain; that the establishing, by the hands of the people, a new system of rule over that long-oppressed nation, would prove a *dangerous example*. But, to whom could the example be dangerous? Not to their Royal Master or his Family, whose subjects, though not without their grounds of complaint as to certain measures of his successive sets of servants, were in a situation having nothing in common with that of the people of Spain, any more than with that of the inhabitants of Guinea. Did they fear for the despotisms of the continent? If so, it would argue, that all which they and their partisans have said about the despotism of Napoleon is not believed by themselves; for, otherwise, they must have thought, that the best possible way of attacking Napoleon's government, was, to erect a free government in a great nation upon his frontiers. Did they fear for other governments of Europe, all of whom, by-the-by, were at war with us? Did their love of monarchy so far subdue and swallow up their hatred of our enemies? If so, the feeling was the foolishest, the most senseless, that ever was entertained; for who does not see the utter impossibility of supporting those governments by any other means than those of *reformation*; aye, of complete regeneration, however terrific the word may sound at Whitehall? There was a time when men might reasonably differ in opinion upon this point; but, after all that we have now seen, it appears to me nothing short of insanity, or of the most criminal hypocrisy, to deny, that this is the only way, in which it is possible for those governments to preserve their existence.—In one of the excellent essays of MAJOR CARTWRIGHT, written at the breaking out of the present war between Russia and Sweden, he foretold, that, unless the king of Sweden began by a reformation at home; by calling the States together; by restoring to

the people the full enjoyment of their ancient constitution, this war would end in his ruin. He described the state of the country; shewed the want of motives in the people to defend it; and applied to this particular case, that principle, which he has so frequently and so ably maintained, namely, that without *a people* well disposed; without a people having motives for national defence, a *standing army*, would, in the end, avail him nothing. This prediction has been completely verified. And, are there still persons to call Major Cartwright a "jacobin"? Aye, are there, and to put a rope round his neck, too, if they could.—What shall we say, then? If this be the case; if men are not to be schooled by events like these, what ground is there to hope, that they will be induced, by reasoning, to act upon the principles, whereon is built the security of states and of thrones?—As to what has occurred in Spain, since the return of our army, there is not much of interest. It was to be expected, that King Joseph would be crowned, and, having power on his side, it was quite natural for him to have an abundance of *flattering addresses*, from an enslaved people led by a gang of venal courtiers. The people who drop their pence into the hell-fire money box would, of course, have no scruple to cringe to the devil, and why should they scruple to cringe to Joseph Napoleon. He will be a despot; but he will do away, or, at least, greatly diminish, the intolerable, the degrading, the impious despotism of the plundering priests. I wish heartily to see him kicked down and afterwards hanged; but, only upon this condition, that the people regain something like freedom; that something like political liberty succeed his fall.—The movements of the people of Cadiz, show, that they are more enlightened than the mass of the nation. Their demands carry in them the spirit of freedom; and, their complaint, that they were deprived of the *use of the press*, shews very clearly how pernicious was the edict of the Central Junta, by which the freedom of the press was put a stop to. That edict disheartened me. After the issuing of that, I entertained no hope of the cause; and, I have been assured, by more than one gentleman, who have been much in Spain, during these times, that that measure more than any other, checked the spirit of those who were sufficiently enlightened and who were able, from their talents, to have acted a considerable part in defending the country against the French. I have been

assured by two persons in particular, upon whose judgment as well as upon whose word I can rely, that it was the decided opinion of *all* the well informed part of the Spaniards, with whom they conversed, that a radical revolution was the first necessary measure of defence; nay, further, that the articles, upon the subject, published by me, at the time when I was charged with being instigated by the devil, were read in Spain, and were highly approved of by all such Spaniards; that those articles were translated and spread widely through the country; and that the edict of the Junta was thought to be levelled particularly at them. Now, what has this edict done? It kept the people *quiet* 'till Joseph came to take possession of them. It was a kind act towards nobody but Joseph Napoleon. It was intended for the use of Ferdinand and the Junta and the Priests; but it operated, as the most of such acts do, in a way directly the contrary of what was intended.

**AUSTRIA.**—There seems to be as much pleasure felt, by the partizans of the ministry, at an approaching war between France and Austria, as if the latter was *sure of the victory*. It is said, that "now" is the time," while Napoleon's armies are in Spain. Just as if he had *no other* armies! Napoleon knows better what he is about than our ministers appear to do, and, therefore, he has taken care to leave a very nice field for their military exploits in *Portugal*, which he is sure he can always drive them from, when he has settled matters elsewhere. He has seen what a hand we make of sending out armies; and, of course, he knows what he has to apprehend from our efforts. The Morning Chronicle, not many days ago, gave an admirable description of the *internal situation* of Austria. The conclusion drawn, was, that, unless a previous reform of the government took place, Austria would be again defeated, if not subdued. This is my opinion, and I believe it to be the general opinion in this country. There is not now, much fear of the public being deceived upon this score; but, deception, as we shall soon see, will not fail to be attempted. We shall have, if war take place, more of Mr. Illeskisson's and Mr. Ward's bulletins, and we shall be considered as jacobins if we do not believe them. The taking of a French hussar will afford a week's subject for bragging. Oh! the millions of lies that are now in egg, if this war be actually about to begin.—Russia is, it seems, to take part with France, in this war; and,

now we shall hear what curious logic will be dished up for the amiable purpose of persuading us, that the "legitimate" prince is not to blame at all, while the "usurper" ought to be put to the rack. I think the regular way, the standing rule, in all such cases, ought to be this: to hold it, as an article of faith, that the Devil is now come upon the earth, and has crept into the body of Buonaparté; whence, it would naturally follow, that all those who act in concert with him and aid him in his views, act under supernatural controul, and, of course, that nothing which they do for him ought to be imputed to any evil propensity in themselves, or in the nature of their offices. Thus the fault will all fall upon him, and the honour of crowned heads will remain untarnished. Hudibras reasons thus: that the Devil is on the side of the wicked; that he is at the head of them; and that when "the Saints" are tempted to commit any sin, the fault is not theirs, but belongs to, and must be answered for by, the wicked, for whose benefit the Devil acts, and for whose sake he sometimes seduces "the Saints." Ah, Sir! said a Russian, to me, just after the rupture between us and Russia, "it is that *fiend* at Paris. It is not the Emperor of Russia "that does this. He loves and admires "England, and would fain live in friendship with her." This appeared to me, at first sight, very strange; but, when I came to recollect the doctrine of Hudibras, the reasonableness of it appeared as clear as day-light. It was upon the same foundation, I beg leave to suppose, that Mr. Canning proceeded, when, in his "uni-versal-Spanish-nation" Declaration, he spoke so *compassionately* of the part which the Russian Autocrat took in the *overture* from ERFURT, while he thundered out so boldly upon the head of Buonaparté; and, indeed, there is an absolute necessity of adopting this Hudibrastic doctrine; for, without it, we must conclude, that the Emperor of Russia, a "legitimate" sovereign, is either a *partner in the crimes*, or is the *tool* of Buonaparté; either of which would reflect but very little honour upon crowned heads, and would not very strongly tend to make people believe, that there was any material difference between legitimate and illegitimate sovereigns.

**AMERICAN STATES.**—The debating gentlemen, who live across the Atlantic, have not, for some months, had much of my attention bestowed upon them. They have now, it seems, repealed their Embargo, except with respect to England and France;

that is to say, they have given their ships liberty *to come out*, under the shabby, the miserable, the despicable appearance of still shewing their resentment against us. They *know*, that the cargoes will come to England; they know that they must come to England; they know that our Sea Orders, preventing them from going any where else, still exist. Aye, and they *intend* they shall come here too; only their silly, their empty pride, will not let them acknowledge it.—Did I not say, that, if our ministers held firm, they would be compelled to repeal this Embargo law? And did I not say, that they would *sneak out* of the thing in some way or other, which would, as they thought, hide their disgrace? No triumph can be more complete than that of the ministers, in this case. They have not moved an inch from their resolution. They have let the Americans do their worst; they have looked quietly on while America passed her *avenging* acts, which were to bring us upon our knees. We were fast *forgoing* her, when she herself, without any compromise, comes to.—I am not, perhaps, very disinterested in these praises of the ministers; for the truth is, that the measures towards America, were as much mine as they were theirs. I alone supported them, while they were assailed by pamphlets and paragraphs and speeches innumerable. That support lost me the friendship of that worthy fellow, the INDEPENDENT WNG, who not only cut me upon the occasion, but ripped up all my old sins, and threw them in my face, which hurt me the more as I sincerely respected the writer and admired his writings, which I still do.—What are now become of all the predictions and alarms; all the threats of starvation and ruin; all the laborious calculations of Lords Grenville and Auckland? What talking, what debating, there were, this time twelve-months, about the Orders in Council and about the *corn*, which, to poor starving England, would not come from America any longer! Lord Grenville spoke of the prospect of a rupture with America, with such manifest apprehensions in his mind, that I really felt pity for his lordship. Mr. Windham, upon whom it was incumbent to make a speech upon the subject, and whose mind is fertile in resource, left off without having distinctly asserted, or denied any thing.—It is always bad to proceed upon a supposition, that there is a natural, inherent deficiency of means of any sort in the country itself; and this was the supposition, upon which

the opposition proceeded in the question relative to America. They might, indeed, well be led to act thus; for it was a favourite scheme of Pitt's, who actually acquired and consolidated his power by persuading the nation, that it depended, for its existence, wholly upon *something other than its people and its own resources*. One time it was India, another time it was the Funds, another time it was the Opening of the Scheldt, another time it was our Allies upon the Continent, and all through, “England's commercial greatness” swelled out the end of his noisy and empty speeches. Well, the Scheldt is shut, our allies upon the Continent are pretty nearly extinguished and have long been lost to us, America has had her embargo, and Buonaparté has shut up all the ports of the Continent; and how do you feel yourself, my honest duped John Bull? Are you starved yet? Do the oxen fat in Devonshire? Do the sheep breed in Dorsetshire? Do the hogs breed and fat in Hampshire and the bees still collect honey there? Do you get wheat enough to make your loaf of? As to beer, the alarm of the barley-growers is, that they shall not know how to get rid of their corn.—This is the master humbug. Only persuade a nation, that it cannot exist upon its own internal resources, and that nation is your slave. The nation is much indebted to Mr. SPENCE for *proving* the contrary; and much indebted to the ministers for having given us a practical demonstration of the truth of his doctrine. Really the Spaniards, in worshipping Dolls made for them by the heretics in Holland, are not much more foolish than were the Englishmen, who were cozened into a belief that they would all die if an end was put to Commerce and the Funds. They appeared, at one time, to believe that Pitt had the power of putting a stop to rains and snows; that it was he who made the grass grow and the corn ripen. But, somehow or other, when he got out of place, he seemed to lose these divine powers. Mr. Addington came, and his partizans attempting to make the praises of Pitt apply to their patron, the thing became ridiculous, and actually the subject of a very smart copy of verses, of which, it was said, Mr. Canning was the author.—The nation is never to be so duped again. The time for that gross duplicity is past. We have now proof, that our own resources are quite sufficient for us, and of this valuable knowledge we shall, I trust, make a proper use.

Botley, Thursday, 6 April, 1809.

MR. LYTTLETON has sent me a Letter, in which he has given me a correct report, according to the best of his recollection, of that part of his Speech, relative to MR. CANNING's ancestry, upon which I took occasion to offer some remarks. He has accompanied this with a criticism upon those remarks, from which criticism he appears to have miscomprehended my meaning much more than the reporter has, according to his own account, miscomprehended his. I inserted what I found in the news-papers, which, as the speeches are permitted to be published, I had a right to do. I am, at all times, happy to correct any report of a speech, or part of a speech; but, I can acknowledge a right in no one to require of me to insert explanations, especially if the request be conveyed in a dictatorial tone. Mr. Lyttleton's "explanation" of his words I do not think proper to insert; but, I here insert his correction of the passage alluded to, which will be quite sufficient for all purposes, as the reader will be fully competent himself to find out the meaning of the words, and to see in what, if in any thing essential, the error of the news-paper reporter consisted.—"That I should not be " deterred from freely uttering my opinion " by any dread of the right hon. gent.'s " eloquence, even though he should exercise himself in raking up some obscure " and scandalous anecdotes respecting my " grandfather, or great-grandfather. That, " indeed, I thought it unworthy of that " right hon. gent.'s talents and generosity " to attack us in that manner, and to engage in a species of warfare, in which " he must be conscious we should meet " him upon unequal terms, since we had " no weapons with which to retort upon " him, in the utter deficiency, as far as " my researches into English History had " gone, either of authentic facts, or even " of traditional rumours respecting his " ancestry. That I did deprecate such " unequal encounters, which I should not " have anticipated, or supposed possible, " if recent experience had not proved the " contrary, and made it a point of prudence to guard one's self against them."

---

### SPEECH

OF

SIR FRANCIS BURDETT,

*At the Meeting at Westminster, 30th March  
1809.*

" GENTLEMEN ELECTORS OF WESTMINSTER,  
" This is the first opportunity that I have had, since you conferred upon me

the honour of being one of your Representatives, of returning you my sincere and heartfelt thanks. If I forbear from saying much of your conduct at the last Election, it is from fear that I should be supposed to be praising myself in praising you; but at the same time, if I were to say nothing, I fear it might by some be considered as ingratitude and insensibility of the honour you have done me. As to the Resolutions which have been read to you, in general they meet my most perfect approbation: but, if there is any one to which I cannot give such entire assent, it is to that in which your kindness to me has induced you to return me particular thanks for the share I took in the discussion of those transactions, which have recently occupied the attention of Parliament and of the Public. The share that I took was certainly not more than what my duty required; and there were several other Members fully as forward in discharging their duty as I was. As to the Resolution of returning your thanks to Col. Wardle, this is most undoubtedly his due; for I am well convinced, that out of the six hundred and fifty-eight Members who compose the House of Commons, there is not another man who would have undertaken what he has undertaken, or would have gone through it as well as he has done. There never was, perhaps, a business of such a nature brought forward, where the mover was so little liable to any imputation. Other public prosecutions may be supposed to originate from disappointed hopes, or personal resentment; but Col. Wardle had no personal disappointments or mortifications to resent, he had no promotion to look for, no hopes to gratify, and had brought the measure forward solely for the public good. His whole conduct of the business evinced the utmost coolness, candour, and impartiality. I should be very happy indeed, to have been able to give the same praise of candour and impartiality to all the Members of that House who were the judges upon that occasion. Those qualities which the judges ought to have possessed, Col. Wardle eminently displayed; and yet great allowances would have been made to the zeal, and even the partial bias, which an accuser may be supposed generally to entertain. In this case, however, the candour, impartiality, and all the qualities which were to be looked for in judges was with the accuser, and very little of those qualities were to be found on the other side. The Gentlemen who have preceded me, have told you

very truly, that these abuses arise from the imperfect state of our Parliamentary representation. I am fully convinced, that there is not, at the present moment, any subject worthy of engaging the serious attention of the English nation, except the necessity of a Reform in Parliament. This sentiment has been always entertained and always avowed by me, and I do flatter myself that it was this sentiment which first recommended me to your notice. We have heard of late of a great many Commissions and Boards of Inquiry, to consider about the growing abuses of Administration; but how does it happen, that, with all their inquiries and all their discoveries, none of the public peculators have been brought to punishment? (*Loud applause.*) They may bring forward Commission after Commission, and Act of Parliament after Act of Parliament, and yet peculation goes on, and the authors of it are not punished. Instead of the guilty being punished, all manner of imputations are always thrown upon those who detect their guilt. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has lately brought in one of those Bills. If my health had allowed me to have been in the House at the time, I should have certainly opposed the introduction of it. I should have objected to that or any other sham and ridiculous plan, which professed what it was evidently impossible that it could accomplish. Of Bills of this sort we have abundance. Lord Melville himself brought in a Bill to prevent corruption in his office, and it was afterwards found that this Bill was so ingeniously worded, that it did not apply to his particular case. You have had persons of all ranks and degrees in life brought to the Bar of the House of Commons, from the high rank of the person who was the subject of the late inquiry, down to the governor of the prison at Cold-bath-fields; and yet, was there an instance of any one of them having been punished? You have already Bills enough to prevent those abuses; but the Bills are a mere dead letter, and the abuses still continue, and are perpetually increasing. You have now upon your Statute-book the Bill of Rights, which was expressly calculated for the prevention of such abuses; and yet this Bill is no longer a protection to the country, for the abuses continue. If the family of the Stuarts had but possessed that knowledge which every body possesses now, the knowledge of managing a Parliament, they never would have been expelled the throne of this country. When

the Bill of Rights stated that standing armies were on no account to be kept up without the consent of Parliament, it had not anticipated the time that Parliaments could be brought to consent to any thing that the King's Ministers should require. At the time in which the Bill of Rights was passed, a standing army was conceived so unconstitutional, and so dangerous to civil liberty, that it was not supposed that Parliament could grant it, except on some case of great emergency. It was a distinct charge against James II. that he kept up a standing army contrary to law; but if he had known the modern art of managing a Parliament, that and much more could have easily been done *according to law.* What, however, is the most cruel and afflictiong consideration is, that that very body to which the people should naturally look up as its protector from those abuses, has become the principal cause of them. So far from the House of Commons representing the sense of the people of England, I have ever found, since I have been a Member of the House of Commons, that the most popular sentiment which can be expressed in that place, is a sentiment of contempt for the people of England, whose Representatives they still profess to be. I do believe that the House of Commons is the only spot in all the world, where the people of England are spoken of with contempt. There they are calumniated, there the character of Englishmen is spoken lightly of, and their opinion and feelings set at nought. If this circumstance does not shew you the necessity of Parliamentary Reform, there is nothing that I can say (were I speaking till night) which could convince you. Among those Bills, of which I have been speaking, there is one which is called *Magna Charta.* This has now grown almost obsolete, and was certainly never mentioned in the Courts of Law. By this law no man was to be imprisoned, except by the course of law. There was no exception in favour of Attorney-Generals granting their informations *ex officio*, and having the King's subjects imprisoned contrary to the due course of law. We had an Habeas Corpus Act too, but our ancestors had not calculated on its being suspended, whenever Ministers should ask Parliament so to do. If those laws are now permitted to remain on our Statute Book, they only stand to shew us in what a degrading situation we are now placed, and from what an eminence we have fallen. It is now high time that the country should

call for such a reform as will give us a House of Commons really looking to the interests of the people, and not to the emoluments which are to be derived from the favour of the Crown. (*Loud applause.*)

“ There is another sentiment which I feel it necessary for me to express, and in which I differ from many persons. I have heard that spirit much applauded which induces the nobility and gentry of this country to turn farmers, and give their principal attention to the cultivation of their estates. Now it appears to me that it forebodes no good to the country, in its present critical situation, to see those who ought to be considered as its natural defenders, desert its cause at such a time as this, indifferent about those abuses which may lead to its utter destruction, and anxious about fattening sheep and oxen. These cares are in themselves very proper; but they should be only of secondary importance to those whose rank and consideration should rather call them to rescue their country from oppression, than to spend their lives, and devote their whole minds to the consideration of the best manner of fattening cattle.

“ I would really wish that those Noblemen and Gentlemen would learn how dangerous it is to them and to the security of their property, to be neglectful of the situation of the country in general. If the country is lost, what will become of their properties? I do really believe that if better measures of defence for the country are not provided, the country will be lost. If, then, some General Junot or Duke of Abrantes becomes the master of it, perhaps indeed these Noblemen or Gentlemen may be still allowed to follow their agricultural experiments (only accounting to him for the profits), and he may be obliged to them for their diligence, and pleased with the discoveries they may make. (*Laughter and applause.*) I see but two measures for the salvation of the country. The first is, to get rid of that intolerable grinding corruption which devours the country, which has placed it in the state of the fabled Prometheus, who was chained to a rock, on whose liver a vulture was constantly preying, but which perpetually grew again. It was in this manner, that notwithstanding the sums which were lavished by corruption, the unexampled industry of the people of this country reproduced the means to supply the constant waste of this infernal corruption. (*Loud applause.*)

“ We hear perpetually of the wonder-

ful beauty and contrivance of the Constitution. Now, if we are to judge from the practice, we must suppose that it is a thing too beautiful to be made use of. The country is over-run with numerous tax-gatherers (armed with excessive powers), besides supervisors, and a number of other revenue-officers, whose titles I do not recollect, but who swarm over the face of the land like insects on the banks of the Nile, and, like them, raised and fattened by corruption. The Bill of the Chancellor of the Exchequer will, like other Bills, be soon a dead letter. Need I mention to you the conduct of Judges, who, for offences committed and tried in this city; send men for years to Dorchester Jail, and to solitary imprisonment? Need I describe to you the horrible cruelty of the punishment of solitary imprisonment? The day that introduced that system into England should stand

‘ For aye accursed in the calendar.’

Do you think, however, that such things are to be remedied by any Bills to be brought in to prevent Judges from acting in this manner? No: they would be effectually prevented by an honest House of Commons, who would call to account Judges, or any other public officers that should abuse the trust reposed in them. Without a House of Commons which really represents the people of England, the country is like a ship without a rudder, which, however it may appear upon the water, is in perpetual danger of shipwreck. We may remember an instance some years ago, of a youth, about 16 or 17 years of age (Mr. Le Maitre), being sent to solitary imprisonment, where he was left for near seven years, without being brought to trial. He had been charged with intending to kill the King, by blowing something out of a reed. It was generally called the Pop-gun Plot; and yet when it was recollected that upon a charge which was probably void of all foundation as well as probability, a man was kept in solitary imprisonment seven years without a trial, I must ask what is the use of Magna Charta, or the Habeas Corpus Bill, or any other Bill which a corrupt House of Commons will permit the Minister to suspend at his pleasure? The abuses of which we complain proceed directly from the corruption which has taken root in the whole system of our Government. Where the source is corrupt, the streams cannot be pure. Where corruption has fastened in the root, it will be discovered in the fruit.

of the tree. Those abuses have arrived to so flagrant a pitch, that even the friends of that system thought it necessary to have commissions and inquiries instituted for the purpose of pruning and dressing the tree which now produces such bitter fruit. This, however, is not our business; we must lay the axe to the root of the tree. (*Loud applause.*) Unless we destroy this hydra of corruption, it will destroy the country. The monster now stands, with harpy claws seizing on all our substance, to supply the means of its boundless prodigality. If this monster is not now subdued and destroyed, England must, like many other nations,

"Lie at the proud feet of a conqueror."

"This is then the task of the people of England, and what we have now to do. I hope this use will be made of the patriotic spirit which has been excited by Colonel Wardle. If it does not produce this effect, it will avail but little. If the people of England can be contented at the present moment to assemble merely for the purpose of saying how glad they are of the resignation of the Duke of York, then the country cannot be saved. I have, however, a better opinion of the people of this country, than to suppose that their hopes and expectations can be so limited. I am free to confess that it is my opinion, that a Parliamentary Reform is now absolutely necessary. If it can be obtained by quiet means, it will be a most fortunate circumstance, not only for the country but for the Government, for they are the most foolish and wicked advisers of the Crown, who advise the Sovereign to treat with scorn the wishes and opinions of the people. When Colonel Wardle brought forward his motion, he was immediately charged with being connected with a conspiracy. This is the common course of every scoundrel who is charged with any crime; he immediately turns about, and charges his accuser. It was, however, somewhat extraordinary, that these Gentlemen, who, with such a mass of evidence before them as was sufficient to convince every other person, could not yet be convinced of any impropriety in the Duke of York, should immediately, and without any evidence at all, find out that Colonel Wardle was a conspirator as soon as he had brought forward his accusation. Before he brought forward this accusation, he had a fair and unimpeached character, but now they tell you he is almost as bad as us Jacobins. (*Loud laughter.*) I can see no

other conspiracy existing, except a conspiracy against every honest man that shall have the boldness to point out guilt, and to endeavour to remedy abuses. Some persons talk a great deal of the danger of popular influence: I would be glad, however, that they would lay their hand on the map of Europe, and point out any one country that has ever been destroyed by the prevalence of popular influence. It is easy to point out those which have been destroyed from their Governments being inattentive to the wishes and wants of the People. I indeed will readily admit, that a House of Commons, sitting in its judicial capacity, should not be governed by popular influence upon any other consideration but justice. I should be as much ashamed to have my vote as a judge biased by any consideration, or whether I was to gain or lose popularity, as I would be to accept a bribe or any other corrupt consideration. The character of the people of this country is not for severity of punishment, not for running down any man by clamour, but they look for patient investigation, and above all for impartial justice, and for laws equally applied to all ranks and degrees.

"Our constitution seems to be something like a partnership concern. There are three partners; the King, the Lords, and the Commons. Now what would be said of any common partnership, where one or two of the partners would take the profits to themselves, but leave the full proportion of burden and risk to the other? What share now has the people of England in this firm? It is my hope and wish that they shall at length be restored to their share. (*Loud applause.*) I think nothing can be more improper or pernicious in its consequences, than the endeavour to couple the rest of the Royal Family with the transactions in which the Duke of York is concerned. The Duke of York should be tried for his own offences; but it is unfair as well as injurious to the country to involve others in that odium which only should belong to the guilty. If his Majesty has been obliged to accept the resignation of the Duke of York, the affliction should not go farther. It puts me in mind of the advice given by Hamlet, when his mother complained:

"O Hamlet, you have cleft my heart in twain!"  
The answer was,

"Then throw away the worser part,  
"And live the purer with the other half."

I hope that the nation has ceased to look

for any advantage from any change of administrations (*cries of no, no, they are all the same.*) We must look no more to parties, and be assured that we never can expect any measures really useful, until the people of England have their proper share in the constitution of their country—(*loud applause.*) As for me, I like this administration just as well as any of the other administrations which have existed in this reign. I do not see that one of them has done more good than the other. I want none of their places either for myself, or for my friends. I would be well content that they would keep their places, if they would only do the country justice. But my mind is fully impressed with the idea, that this justice will never be done until the people of England shall be fairly represented (as by the theory of the Constitution they ought to be) in the Commons House of Parliament."

#### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

##### REVOLUTION IN SWEDEN.

*Letters Patent and Proclamation of his Royal Highness the Duke of Sudermania, Regent of the Swedish Kingdom, to all the Estates of the Realm, concerning a General Diet to be held on the 1st of May, in the present year: Given at the King's Palace, at Stockholm, March 14th 1809.*

We Charles, by the grace of God, assure you, Estates of the Realm, Counts, Barons, Archbishops, Bishops, Nobles, Clergy, Burghers of Cities, and Commonalty, of our particular favour, gracious intentions, and kind affection, under the protection of Almighty God.—Since we, according to our gracious Proclamation of the 13th instant, have found ourselves called upon to take the reins of Government as Regent, in order to save our beloved native country from unavoidable destruction, we have considered it of the highest importance to deliberate with the States of the Realm, upon the means which may procure and confirm the future happiness of the Swedish nation. We wish, therefore, and command that all the States of the Realm may assemble in the Capital of the Kingdom before the 1st of May next, and that not only the Nobility may regulate their conduct by the laws for the House of Nobles given on the 6th of June, 1626, by the king Gustavus Adolphus, of glorious memory, &c. and re-

vived and confirmed by king Gustavus III. on the 9th of November, 1778, but that the other States, which, as usual, send Deputies, may observe the following order: From the Clergy are expected to appear the Archbishop, every Bishop from his Diocese, the first Pastor in Stockholm, together with so many from each Diocese as usual, and of the other States, as many as usual, all provided with necessary letters of deputation, in order that we may be able to begin the Diet, and after its being fortunately finished, give you permission to return every one to his province. Which every one must respectfully observe, and we are, &c. &c.

*Address of his Royal Highness the Duke of Sudermania, to the People of Sweden, dated Stockholm, March 15, 1809.*

His Royal Highness the Duke of Sudermania deems it right, and conformable to the duties of his high station, publicly to lay before the Swedish people, the motives and causes which produced the important change, which has lately taken place in the Government of this country.—The archives of the state contain a great variety of documents, which will prove the necessity of that measure, both to the present age and posterity.—For this long time past the public opinion condemned a system of warfare, which so little suits a country, the commercial concerns of which claim that neutrality, which her fortunate geographical situation, that seems to secure Sweden, demands, and which was sacrificed by the Government. As early as 1805, Sweden, joined by other Powers, entered into a war with France, which from local circumstances, was then, however, confined to the loss of her trade with nearly all the States of Europe; a loss which, although not to be compared with that she has since sustained, was yet of great moment.—Soon after differences with Prussia arose, which, however, were not attended with consequences equally important. In 1807, the share which Sweden took in the coalition against France became momentous, and its influence on the dearest interests of the country more detrimental. Swedish Pomerania was occupied by foreign troops, and Stralsund besieged; yet one prospect of more fortunate times yet remained included.

(To be continued.)

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 15.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 15, 1809.

[Price 1s.

" Your Lordship knows, that had I followed my own opinion, as a military man, I should have retired with the army from Salamanca. The Spanish armies were then beaten; there was no Spanish force to which we could unite; and I was satisfied that no efforts would be made to aid us, or to favour the cause in which they were engaged.—I was sensible, however, that the apathy and indifference of the Spaniards would never have been believed; that had the British been withdrawn, the loss of the cause would have been imputed to their retreat, and it was necessary to risk this army to convince the people of England, as well as the rest of Europe, that the Spaniards had neither the power nor the inclination to make any efforts for themselves. It was for this reason that I made the march to Sahagan. As a diversion, it succeeded: I brought the whole disposable force of the French against this army, and it has been allowed to follow me, without a single movement being made to favour my retreat. The people of the Galicias, though armed, made no attempt to stop the passage of the French through the mountains. They abandoned their dwellings at our approach, drove away their carts, oxen, and every thing that could be of the smallest aid to the army. The consequence has been, that our sick have been left behind; and when our horses or mules failed, which on such marches, and through such a country, was the case to a great extent, baggage, ammunition, stores, &c. and even money, were necessarily destroyed or abandoned."—See JOHN MOORE'S Letter to Lord Castlereagh, dated Corinna, 13 Jan. 1809.

545]

[546]

## HAMPSHIRE MEETING.

On Saturday, the 8th instant, the following Requisition was carried to Mr. BLACKBURN, the High Sheriff; by Mr. COBBETT of Botley, and Mr. HOUGHTON of Durley. On Wednesday the 12th, the Sheriff transmitted to them his Notice for the Meeting, as it will be seen at the bottom of the signatures.

To the High Sheriff of the County of SOUTHAMPTON.

SIR, Winchester, 8th April, 1809.

We, the undersigned Freeholders and other Landholders of the County of Southampton, request that you will be pleased to call a Meeting of the Inhabitants of this County, to be holden at Winchester, on such day as shall, at no great distance, be convenient to you, in order to afford us, and the Inhabitants of this County in general, an opportunity of publicly and formally giving our thanks to Gwyllum L. Wardle, Esq. M.P. for his upright and public-spirited conduct, during the recent Inquiry before the House of Commons; and also of expressing our sentiments upon the subjects of that Inquiry.

William Cobbett .....	Botley.
John Hopkinson .....	Eling.
Thomas Comley .....	Rumsey.
Stephen Leach.....	Rumsey.
Thomas King .....	Eling.
John Comley .....	Rutwy.
C. H. Longcroft .....	Hamble.
Benjamin Goodeve .....	Gosport.
James Sharp .....	Rumsey.
Christopher Keele .....	Broughton.
Samuel Pheue .....	Rumsey.
John Colson .....	Southampton.
Joseph Jackson.....	Rumsey.

John Black .....	Rumsey.
Edward Toomer .....	Southampton.
Charles Godfrey .....	Rumsey.
Thomas Bernard .....	Mitchesmarsh.
Thomas Nichols .....	Southampton.
William Green.....	Kimbridge.
Peter Jewell.....	Timsbury.
Rev. John Webster .....	Bursledon.
Samuel Sharp .....	Rumsey.
Moses Wilkins .....	Braishfield.
Aaron Barking.....	Rumsey.
Josiah George .....	Rumsey.
Jacob Colson .....	Braishfield.
Joshua Short .....	Brockenhurst.
John Wilt.....	Eling.
James Hayter .....	Eling.
Thomas Sutton.....	Southampton.
John Goldsmith .....	Hambledon.
William Biles .....	Eling.
Edward Houghton .....	Durley.
William Metchard .....	Eling.
Giles Barnes.....	Tichborne.
John Saunders .....	Eling.
William Twynam .....	Soberton.
Francis Hoare .....	Soberton.
Peter Knight .....	Soberton.
Henry Parrott .....	Droxford.
William Powlett Powlett....	
Thomas Hatch.....	Soberton.
John Cotman .....	Hambledon.
Francis Godrich .....	Tichborne.
William Agate.....	Ovington.
John Sayer .....	Winchester.
H. Mulcock .....	Kilmiston.
Joseph May.....	Bramshaw.
Rev. Thomas May .....	
John Stroud .....	Timsbury.
James May .....	Rumsey.
William Barnett .....	Rumsey.
John Kelaway .....	Fordingbridge.
W. W. Wright.....	Sopley.
John Skeats .....	Lymington.
Matthew Aldridge .....	Treloar.
George Aldridge .....	Christchurch.
Thomas Gatrell .....	Lymington.
Ambrose Dav .....	Wick.
George Benson.....	Ringwood.
John Clay .....	Portsmouth.
John Shoveller .....	Portsmouth.

A'alexander Carter .....	Ringwood.
Samuel Blake .....	Rumsey.
James Traver .....	Rumsey.
Robert Moody .....	Winchester.
Richard Mills .....	Beworth.
James Baverstock .....	Alton.
E. H. Grey .....	Alton.

In compliance with the above Request, I hereby appoint a Meeting of the Inhabitants of the said County to be holden at the Castle of Winchester, on Tuesday, the 25th day of April instant, at tweve o'clock at noon.     (Signed)

JOHN BLACKBURN, Sheriff.  
Preston Candover, 11th April, 1809.

#### TO THE PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

The above Requisition is, as you will see, signed by none of those *Noblemen* or *Baronets*, who have been in the habit of putting their names to papers of that sort; and this circumstance, so far from being unpleasing, is, to me, and, I trust, it will be to you, a very pleasing one. Not that any of us can wish to see those persons hang back upon an occasion in which all the best public feelings urged every soul to step forward; but, because the Requisition, as it now stands, will convince them, and also the king's ministers, who have so long dictated to this county, that there is yet remaining in Hampshire a spirit of independence not so very easily to be subdued. It will show to our countrymen in general, that, though the ministry of the day do cause to be elected whatever County Members they please, there is still a spirit in the people to feel indignant at the wrongs and the insults they endure. It will show to those parties, who have, for so many years, divided the county between them, and who have, by turns, profited from its credulity, that the county is no longer to be held in leading strings; that we have sense to think, and courage to act for ourselves.—What, let me ask, could be more degrading to us, than to see existing a practice of calling county-meetings by ten or twelve persons, of each of the *parties* respectively, always nearly the same persons, just as if it was an office they held for that purpose, and just as if all the other Landholders, all the Farmers, all the Tradesmen, and, indeed, the whole of the population of the county, were so many mere puppets, or tools, in their hands, to be called together for the purpose of voting just what those settled and established leaders chose to write down upon a piece of paper, and read to them? What, let me again put it to you, could

possibly be more degrading than this?—I have heard, and you, I am sure, will hear it with pleasure, that some of the Noblemen and other persons of great property in the county, who have not signed the Requisition, do nevertheless highly approve of it, and do intend to be at the Meeting; and, perhaps, they may have thought, that, upon such an occasion, it was best to avoid every thing which should give to the origin of the proceeding a *party* complexion. If such was their motive, it is one of which we cannot find fault, provided they now show us, that they are disposed to lend their hand in putting down for ever that system of Corruption, which has been *proved* to have long existed, and by the means of which we have been so mercilessly plundered. For my own part, nothing would give me so much pleasure as to see the leaders of both parties come to the Meeting, and divide between them the honour of proposing to us such Resolutions as the occasion demands; never forgetting, however, that Mr. Wm. Powlett Powlett, who, unsolicited, came and put his name amongst ours, has, upon us, not only now, but upon all future occasions, a clear and indisputable claim to the precedence.—But, let who will be the proposer, we must take care that what we approve of be *good and sound*; we must take care, that our real sentiments be fully expressed, and not frittered away, until it be hard to distinguish our censure from our praise. Our feelings, upon this occasion, are strong; our opinions clear and fixed; and we shall act a very inconsistent part, indeed, unless our language corresponds with those opinions and those feelings.—It must be manifest to every man in his senses, that, unless a stop be speedily put to the workings of corruption, one of two things will happen: the complete slavery of us all, or the overthrow of the government; and, it must be equally manifest, that this alternative is to be avoided by no other means than the legal and constitutional interference of the people themselves, and especially the people who are in the middling walks of life, who have property to preserve and who have judgment to direct their actions. It is a common excuse, that, “*one man can do nothing.*” Not much of *himself*; perhaps; but, without *one man* there would be *no men* in the world. Millions are made up of *ours*; and, if *every man* were to say, “what can *I* do,” there would, of course, be nothing done. There are few of us, who do not put ourselves to some inconve-

nience for the sake of our *private* advantage; or, rather, the labours and fatigues we undergo for that purpose, we think nothing of. And, shall we, then, not endure a little labour and fatigue for the *public* advantage, especially as it is impossible for the public to be benefited without each of us having his due share of that benefit? Besides, there is, in the present case, a motive far superior to all selfish considerations. We are now called upon to thank the man, who has risked every thing for us; we are called upon to do an act of justice, and if we do not answer the call, we have nothing of Englishmen left in us but the name.—We should always bear in mind, that the king's ministers declared, that, if a Vote of THANKS to MR. WARDLE was moved, in the House of Commons, they would *oppose it*, and there is no doubt but they would have had a majority on their side. Well, if the House of Commons refuse him thanks for the inestimable good, which he has done for the people, there is so much the stronger call upon the people to thank him; and, for them to grudge any labour or pains to do it with effect would argue, in them, a want of common sense as well as of gratitude; for, we may be assured, that, unless MR. WARDLE be supported by the unequivocal voice of the people, no man will be much inclined to imitate him; and, it is hardly necessary to say, that, unless more and *much more* be done, that which has been done will be worth nothing at all, in the space of a few months.—For these reasons all persons who are able to attend the Meeting ought to attend it, be the inconvenience what it may, nothing being a good excuse short of actual bodily infirmity.—I shall add a few words as to the part which *I have acted* in this proceeding. There are not wanting persons to hint, that I am actuated by *ambitious motives*, and to draw conclusions of this sort from my name standing at the head of the Requisition. Now, the facts are these. I, in the first place, inquired, whether the Lords and the Barons intended to send a Requisition, and I found they did not. It was then *proposed to me*, by several persons, to join in a Requisition. When it was drawn up, I did not sign it, till many others had been asked to sign first; and, even then, a space was left *above* my name, in order that the names of any noblemen or gentlemen or yeomen might be placed before mine upon the list. Several gentlemen, amongst whom were Mr. Powlett Powlett and Mr. May, I believe, were par-

ticularly asked to place their names at the top of the list, which they declined, and in which they discovered minds superior to that false pride, which never yet was characteristic of a real gentleman. I do, I must confess, feel some pride at seeing my name at the head of such a list; but, not a single name was placed in that list at my *request*; I did not even *ask* any man to sign it; and the pride I feel arises, not from the vain and empty notion that I possess an influence over any man, but that my principles and views correspond with those of so many intelligent, public-spirited, and respectable Tradesmen and Yeomen, to be regarded as *one of whom*, is the utmost bounds of my ambition. I have no silly and stupid pursuit of popularity. I have seen too much of the vexations and the miseries of all such pursuits. I would not shake a knave by the hand if his vote would make me not only a member for, but the *owner* of, the county; nor would I, if I could, even without asking for, be a member of parliament, or fill any post or employment whatever under, or in, the government. I have, though not yet very old, had quite enough both of censure and applause. Constant observation has convinced me, that happiness is seldom the companion of a pursuit after power; and my taste as well as my reason lead me to avoid all such pursuits. Indeed, I could be well content never to go out of the valley, in which I live; but, the duty of a father and an Englishman, calls imperiously upon me not to stand with my arms folded and see my children and my country robbed, disgraced, and enslaved. Our forefathers wrote and strove and fought and bled for us; and, if we can tamely see those rights, which their talents, their courage, and their perseverance entailed on us, taken away, little by little, until there is nothing left as a protection for those to whom we have given life, we are not only amongst the most base, but we are the very basest of all mankind.—I have had too much opportunity of studying men and things to be led astray by any *wild theories about liberty*. I know, that there must be *government*, and that there must be *law*, without which there can be no such thing as *property*, nor any safety even for our persons. I want to see no *innovation* in England. All I wish and all I strive for, is *The Constitution of England*, undefiled by corruption. I am very willing to make even great allowances for the neglects and faults of men in power; because I see, that, even in our

own private concerns, we are, the very best of us, frequently guilty of both. But, when I see a system of public corruption, of barefaced public robbery, brought to light, and hear those, who have had the virtue to make the exposure, termed enemies of the country; when I see my country thus pillaged and thus insulted, I should hate the very sound of my name, if I were not ready to affix it to a protest against such proceedings.

WILLIAM COBBETT.

*Potley, Thursday, 13th April, 1809.*

#### SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

SPAIN.—In my last, I offered to the public some observations relative to the measures of our government in regard to Spain; and, reasoning upon former dispatches, from Sir John Moore, shewed, as I thought, and still think, that the loss and disgrace arising from the embarrassed situation, and from the final flight of our army, were to be solely ascribed, as to their immediate cause, to the fear of Sir John Moore of coming back without doing something, which fear arose from the false notions, so industriously propagated in England, respecting the force and the spirit of the people of Spain.—Indeed, before I had seen any of the latter dispatches of that unfortunate General, and just at the time when we first heard of his death, I stated to my readers that this had been the real cause of all the misfortunes of him and his army. But now, we have the *proof* in his own last words, that this was the cause; that “it was necessary to *risk* the army, “to convince the people of England, that the Spaniards had neither the power nor the “inclination to make any efforts for themselves;” that is to say, that the almost certain destruction; that all the miseries of the army; that the loss of so many valuable lives; that death, in its most horrid form, suffered by so many Englishmen; that all this was necessary to open the eyes of Englishmen at home to the *truth* respecting Spain; that all this was necessary on account of the *false notions* entertained by the people of England.—Now, this is a very heavy charge against the people of England; and, I must confess, that the charge is but too well founded; though, had I been in the place of Sir John Moore, I would not, from any such motive, have risked the army; and, if I had *risked* it at all, it should have been in *meeting*, and not in *fleeing from*, the enemy; for, much more honourable, and ultimately more beneficial to my country, should I have

thought it, to see half my men killed, and the other half, when overpowered by numbers beyond the hope of extricating themselves, led captive into France, than to see the whole of that army flee from an enemy, whom it had scarcely a glimpse of till the very last, and indeed, whom, if the transports had been ready, it never would have seen in numbers one fifth equal to its own.—But, while I acknowledge the justice of the charge against *the people of England*, what am I to say of those, *by whom the people of England were deceived*? What am I to say of the Turtle Patriots, and of that minister of the king, who, in the most solemn manner, and in his master’s name, told us of the resistance to be expected by the French from “the universal Spanish nation?” True, the people of England ought not to have believed these persons; but, still what are we to say of the conduct of these persons? To that sentence, wherein the unfortunate General speaks of the groundless belief of the people of England, he might have added, and he ought to have added, a censure upon those, by whom the people of England had been deceived.

—For endeavouring, in the months of June and July last, to prevent this spreading deception; for telling the people of England *not to believe* that the Spaniards would make exertions for Ferdinand; for warning them not to give into expectations which must be disappointed; for using all my efforts to destroy those false notions, the existence of which it is now *proved* was the cause of Sir John Moore’s *risking* the army: for doing this, I was, by the writers on the side of the ministry, denominated a *Jacobin*, and was accused of endeavouring, under the immediate instigation of the devil, to subvert the throne, the church, and all the establishments of England. This is the standing charge. It is a charge preferred against every man, who complains of any public grievance, or who endeavours to open the eyes of the people to any fault or any folly of any man in power. To make war for what was called a “legitimate sovereign,” to spend the money and spill the blood of Englishmen for the support of monarchy in Spain, was a favourite scheme; the people were dragged together in town and county meetings to thank the king (that is to say, his ministers) for having embarked the nation in this hopeful cause;—and, to point out to the people that they were deceived, and that the cause was a rotten one; this was, of course,

to be a *jacobin* and an enemy of the *throne* and the *church*; a man wishing for anarchy and confusion, for the destruction of all property, and for universal plunder and massacre.—I insert the *whole* of Sir John Moore's letter, in a subsequent page of this sheet; but there is one more passage in it, which is worthy of particular attention. He says: “I am sorry to say, “that the army, whose conduct I had such “reason to extol, on its march through “Portugal, and on its arrival in Spain, *has totally changed its character since it began to retreat. I can say nothing in its favour, but that when there was a prospect of fighting the enemy, the MEN were then orderly, and seemed pleased and determined to do their duty.*” The “MEN,” observe. He does not say the *officers* and the men. The whole army has his *censure*, and the applauding exception applies only to the *men*.—Now, then, what are become of all the evidence to character, which Mr. Yorke called forth, from Gen. Fitzpatrick, Sir James Pulteney and others, in favour of the Duke of York, and about that non-pareil of *discipline*, which the wisdom of that gallant Chieftain had introduced into the army? Where are we now to look for the excellence of that discipline? When I ventured to doubt of its existence, there were persons to say, that I ought to have fifty swords run through my body at once. But, here we have it under the General's own hand, that the army was bad in every respect, except in the *native courage* of the men. Indeed, as to this latter point, not only were the men pleased when there was a prospect of fighting the enemy; but, I state, upon the word of an eye and ear witness, that the men, during the whole of the retreat, blamed the precipitancy of the retreat, asked aloud, “what are we running away from?” and were by no means sparing of their execrations upon this score.—Some of the public prints have expressed their regret, that this letter has been published. After all, it is, as the reader will see, but an *extract* of the letter; and, if the whole had been published, it is probable we should have had a pretty view of the situation of Spain. But, what *harm* can the publication do? Or, are there men so wedded to error, that they are sorry to be undeceived? Was it wrong to let us see, that we had been deceived with regard to the inclination of the people in Spain? “But, the army!” Well, what of the army? Are we not to know the *truth* about the army? Or are we to

know them only by the sums we pay for their support?—This letter of Sir John Moore is very valuable. It will be an answer to all those, who talk of the Duke of York's discipline. Sir Arthur Wellesley said, that the Duke of York merited his full share of the thanks that were given for the “victory” of Vimiera; let him, then, take his full share of whatever is due to the conduct of the army in its Spanish retreat.—But, reader, after what we have seen of the appointment of officers, upon whom all *discipline* must depend, need we wonder at what the unfortunate General says? Could we have heard the *true history* of many other of our famous expeditions, we should not have been astounded by the letter of Sir John Moore, who, observe, gives the account, we have been reading, in a letter which he considers as *private*, and the ministers have, very evidently, consented to its publication, with a view of throwing the blame upon the army, or, at least, removing to the army a part of the blame, attached, before, solely to themselves. But, theirs is the blame of the *original cause* of all this evil. They should have known, that the people of Spain had neither force nor inclination to assist themselves; or, rather, to assist *king Ferdinand*, the design of making war for whom was first announced to the world in a *toast*, given by Mr. Canning, at the feast of the *Turtle Patriots*. This is what I charge them with. Their military blunders are nothing when compared to this, which is a fault that admits not of excuse or of palliation. Was there ever any thing so mad? Did ever any scheme bear upon the front of it such marks of genuine folly, as this scheme of fighting, and making the people of Spain fight, for a government, which they themselves had termed “infamous?” Besides, there was the rule of the *priests*. The existence of that alone must, one would think, have convinced any sane person, that the people of Spain were not prepared for any exertion, proceeding from public spirit. Why, the mass of the people in Spain have never heard, their ears have never received even the *sound* of the words *freedom* and *independence*. They have never entertained the idea of *liberty* or of *property*. Need you, then, wonder at the “*apathy*” and “*indifference*,” of which Sir John Moore speaks? A people in such a state think about how they are to get enough to eat and drink and to keep their bodies from the inclemency of the weather; but, what, in the name of *reason*, should they

*fight for?* Where, unless you first enlighten them, and break their chains, and give them motives, are they to see an inducement for sacrificing their lives?—The same game, however, is, it seems, to be played in *Portugal*, whether, if the news-papers be correct, another expedition is going or gone. One would have thought, that we had had enough, in all conscience, of this work. But, there will be no end to it, as long as there is a spot of earth whereon for us to play our miserable pranks.—In *Sicily*, we have, I think, from 12 to 18 thousand men pent up; and, *for what?* In order to know that well, you must read a pamphlet, not long ago published by Mr. Lekie. In that you will see very clearly the reason for keeping 18 thousand English troops in that Island. The Prince Regent of *Portugal* has, it seems, appointed one of *our* Generals (Beresford) to be Field Marshal of *Portugal*. This act speaks pretty plainly for itself. It clearly shews what the Prince Regent thinks of the attachment of his own subjects. The Portuguese General FREIRE is said to have been butchered by his troops, on an accusation of *treachery*; while the French were advancing towards Oporto. And, this is the country, to which we are sending another army, at an expence enormous! — One of the news-papers complains, that, since the retreat of Sir John Moore's army, the people of England are become *cool* as to the cause in Spain; the reason is, that they now understand *what that cause really is*; that they now know something of the situation of the people of Spain; in short, they are become cool, because they are no longer duped; because they see, that the war, if it had terminated successfully, would have only served to rivet the chains of the enslaved. The people of England are no longer to be made believe, that Ferdinand is to be got out of the clutches of Napoleon by the Spaniards, any more than, by the exertions of a pigeon, the cuckoo is to be wrested from the talons of a kite. It is quite enough, I think, for the people of England to stand patiently and see their earnings wasted in these expeditions, without calling on them to huzza and make bonfires for joy — There are hundreds upon hundreds, who fatten upon these enterprizes; who hail them with shouts of triumph; to whom an expedition is a dead fortune. That such persons should be *enthusiastic* in the cause is natural enough; but, that those who pay, that those whose comforts and whose necessities are so much

abridged by the expeditions; that such persons should rejoice at them would be unnatural indeed. Besides, the people of England are now convinced, that a remedy for these and all other political evils is to be found no where but *at home*. They know, that it matters to them not a straw what is done in Sicily or in any other country but England; and, they do really seem to be resolved, that nothing shall any longer delude them, or draw off their attention.

MR. WARDLE.—In the news-papers of Wednesday, the 12th instant, it is stated, that, at the WHIG CLUB, held on the 11th, MR. WARDLE was proposed, as a *candidate* for the honour of being a member, which proposition was, it is said, received with enthusiasm.—Now, I, *from authority*, state, that this proposition was made *without the approbation*, and even without the knowledge of Mr. Wardle; and, I must say, that it was taking an unwarrantable liberty with a name, no small part of the praises attached to which have arisen from the circumstance of his belonging to neither of the *two parties*.—With this exception, I see nothing to be disapproved of in the proceedings of the CLUB, upon this occasion; their Resolutions being very good, and their speeches too. But, why keep the Club up at all? The very existence of it is a mischief. It reminds people of what ought now to be forgotten; besides which, I defy any man to shew me, that a Club, of any sort, ever did any good. How many hundreds of Clubs and Associations have we seen! And, have they, all put together, done a hundredth part so much as we have this last winter, seen done by *ONE MAN*? It seems to be in the nature of the people of England (and they are a people of good sober sense) to suspect; to view with a suspicious eye every thing done by a political association. They regard such associations as only another sort of rulers; men combined for the furtherance of their own private views; and they turn a deaf ear to them accordingly. As to this Club in particular, it is notorious that it was established for the purpose of keeping together a body of parliamentary interest, for the purpose of getting possession of the power and emoluments of the state. To suppose, that the people will ever have any confidence in such a Club is folly in the highest degree.—There are people, who are for taking the *support* of the Whigs. They will never give any support to any thing that is good. No: they are a *body of politicians* and the people will not hear,

them. Are not Lord Erskine and General Fitzpatrick members of this Club? Oh! it can do no good. It must do harm; and I should not be at all surprized if that was the real intention of a far greater part of the members. Is not Mr. Sheridan a member of this club? In short, have we not seen the Club *in place*? When in place, did they not vow they would carry on everlasting war for Hanover; did they not double the Income Tax; did they not augment the number of foreign troops; did they not pass a law to enable Lord Grenville to hold a sinecure of £4,000 with a place of £6,000 a year; and did they not end their career by withdrawing a bill from before the House of Commons, avowedly because the said bill was not approved of by the king? No, no; let us have nothing to do with Whig Clubs. If good cannot be done without them, it cannot be done with them. Three or four honest and able and persevering men, with the people at their back, will easily do all that is wanted to be done; but, if these men join a Club, not only the Whig Club, but a Club of any sort, nothing will be done. There will be a great deal of noise; a great deal of toasting and flattering one another to their faces; but there will be no work; there will be no redress obtained for the nation. It is impossible that men, who meet to eat and drink and to make speeches, flattering one another to their faces, can do any good. We shall have Mr. Sheridan, who told Mr. Wardle he was imposed upon by a "foul conspiracy," shewing his face again soon. He will be at the next meeting of the Club, and will make us a flaming speech about liberty, and Mr. Fox. It is too much to tolerate this farce any longer. The best way is for this Club and the Pitt Club to meet, at their different stations, and fire off their toasts at one another, to the amusement of the nation; but, for shame's sake, let not the former attempt to impose upon us with any of its old, stale, rotten professions of patriotism. How Mr. Whitbread can lend his name to the proceedings of this Club is astonishing to me.

MRS. CLARKE'S BOOK is not, I earnestly hope, either suppressed, or to be suppressed. I should be very sorry if it was. We have a right to know all that she knows about public matters, and I am sure it would be greatly *advantageous* to us to know it.—There are some persons, who appear to think that we have already seen enough; but, out it must all come. We have not yet seen one verse of one of the chapters

of one of the books of one of the volumes of corruption. What we have yet got a sight of is as a blade of grass to a whole meadow.—Let us have Mrs. Clarke's little book by all means. Why should we not know what is passing and what has passed? She must be a woman divested of all sentiments of honour, if she suppress this book. It will be a compromise from such base motives. I cannot believe it.

*Botley, 13th of April, 1809.*

The Subscription for the Miss Taylors will be closed on the first of May, when a sum will have been obtained quite sufficient for their future comfortable support. The Public has, upon this occasion, shown its humanity as well as its justice; and, I hope, that the objects of its liberality will derive lasting benefit from it. It is intended to purchase annuities secured upon land, of the particulars of which the Subscribers shall be duly informed.

\* \* \* From the List of the Minority on Mr. Wardle's Motion, which is given at p. 419, the reader will please to strike out the Name of Mr. Whitmore; and instead of G. N. Noel it ought to be *Charles Noel Noel*. With these corrections, this ever-memorable List, is, I believe, perfectly correct.

---

## COBBETT'S Parliamentary History OF ENGLAND,

Which, in the compass of Sixteen Volumes, Royal Octavo, will contain a full and accurate Report of all the recorded Proceedings, and of all the Speeches in both Houses of Parliament, from the earliest times to the year 1803, when the publication of "Cobbett's Parliamentary Debates" commenced.

The Subscribers to the above work are respectfully informed, that the Fifth Volume will be delivered to them on Saturday next the 22nd instant. It embraces the period from the Revolution, in 1688, to the Accession of QUEEN ANNE, in the year 1702. For this period, the materials, as well for the Proceedings as the Debates, have been, for the most part, collected from the following Works:

1. The Journals of the House of Lords;
2. The Journals of the House of Commons;
3. The Debates of the House of Commons,

from 1688 to 1694, collected by the Honourable Anchitell Grey, who was forty years member for the town of Derby; 4. The Debate between the Lords and the Commons, at a Free Conference, held in the Painted Chamber, in the Session of the Convention, in 1688, relating to the words, “*Abdicated*,” and “*the Vacancy of the Throne*,” used in the Vote of the Commons; 5. A Collection of the Debates and Proceedings in Parliament, in 1694 and 1695, upon the Inquiry into the late Briberies and corrupt Practices, printed in the year 1695; 6. Proceedings in the House of Commons against Sir John Fenwick, printed in the year 1698; 7. Timberland’s History and Proceedings of the House of Lords; and 8. Chandler’s History and Proceedings of the House of Commons.—Here again, as in former Volumes, recourse has been had to the best historians and contemporary writers; and, amongst others, to Burnet, Echard, Kenett, Oldmixon, Ralph, Tindal, Boyer, and Somerville. The Hardwicke Papers have also been consulted; as also the State Tracts, and the Harleian Collection.—There is subjoined, by way of Appendix, a Collection of very scarce and valuable Parliamentary Tracts, taken from those of Lord Sommers, the Harleian Miscellany, and the Collection of State Tracts published during the reign of William the Third.

#### PROCEEDINGS

*In COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &c. relative to the recent INQUIRY in the House of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK.*

TOWN OF GLASGOW.  
See page 454 of this Volume.

CITY OF CANTERBURY.  
See page 455 of this Volume.

CITY OF WESTMINSTER.  
See page 502 of this Volume.

CITY OF LONDON, COMMON HALL.  
See page 517 of this Volume.

#### CITY OF ROCHESTER.

At a Common Hall held at Rochester, March 27, 1809, to consider the propriety of passing a Vote of Thanks to Mr. Wardle, and the other Members of the House of Commons who assisted in the late Investigation into the Conduct of the Duke of York:

Resolved: That this Meeting, duly sensible of the advantages the country will derive, from the Charges produced by G. L. Wardle, esq., M. P. in the honourable House of Commons, against the late Commander-in-Chief, the same having, as this Meeting conceives, occasioned his resignation; and highly appreciating the collected and dignified manner he conducted himself throughout the anxious and critical investigation; beg leave to offer him their best and most grateful acknowledgments for his manly, zealous, and patriotic exertions.

Resolved: That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that the conduct of John Calcraft, esq., our worthy Representative, has, by the aid he afforded the honourable Mover of the Charges, and the ability he evinced on the occasion, entitled himself to the gratitude and support of every citizen who wishes well to his country, and the independence of this city.

Resolved: That the best thanks of this Meeting be given to Lord Folkestone, Sir Francis Burdett, and Samuel Whitbread, esq., M. P. and those other Members of the House of Commons, who supported Mr. Wardle, on the late momentous question.

#### CITY OF GLOUCESTER, AND COUNTY OF THE SAME CITY.

At a Common Council House, held at the Tolsey, in the said City, on Wednesday, the 29th day of March, in the forty-ninth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lord George the Third, by the grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, and in the year of our Lord, 1809:

Resolved, That the Freedom of the said City, accompanied with the Thanks of this Corporation, be given to Gwyllum Lloyd Wardle, esq. for his manly and patriotic exertions in instituting and prosecuting an inquiry into the abuses relative to Military Promotions, notwithstanding the various and formidable obstacles which he had to encounter, in bringing forward and conducting so important an Inquiry.

Resolved, That the grant of the Freedom of the same City, together with such Vote of Thanks, be communicated by the Deputy Town-Clerk, to Colonel Wardle, assigning the reason for which the above honour has been conferred upon him.

Resolved, That the Thanks of this House be given to Henry Howard, and Robert Morris, esqrs. Representatives of this City,

for their honourable support of Colonel Wardle in Parliament.

Resolved, That the above Resolutions be inserted in two Morning and two Evening London Papers, and also in the Gloucester Journal and Gloucester Herald.

R. P. WILTON, Dep. Town Clerk.

#### TOWN OF CALNE.

At a meeting of the Guild, Stewards, Burgesses, and Inhabitants of the Borough and Town of Calne, convened for the purpose of considering the propriety of Thanking Colonel Wardle for his patriotic conduct in Parliament, the following Address being proposed and seconded, was unanimously carried, and signed by all present:

" To G. L. Wardle, esq., M. P. the mover of the Charges in the House of Commons, against his royal highness the Duke of York :—We, the Guild, Stewards, Burgesses, and Inhabitants of the Town and Borough of Calne, assembled, feel it our duty, as members of a free country, to express our sense of your public conduct.—We admire alike your courage and manliness, in standing forward, singly and unaided, and laying your Charges "in a "tangible shape" before the Representatives of the People; your firmness and judgment in supporting them; and your moderation, when truth had silenced the warnings of responsibility, and threats of infamy, from Ministerial arrogance.—We consider that no efforts of genius nor any feats of heroism can, at this time, render the country such essential service as the honest exertions of independent Members of Parliament, to expose and exterminate corruption.—And we most unequivocally give you our cordial, sincere, and grateful thanks.—We love our King and Constitution, and complain of no sacrifices that we are called upon to make for their security and support; but we cannot be insensible that too much of our treasure is diverted from the proper channels of national benefit, and lavished on party adherents and sleeping placemen. We however confidently trust that through the course of your political career, so vigorously and usefully began, you will maintain your independence, and suffer no attachment to party to warp you from the people's cause."

Guildhall, Calne, March 30, 1809.

#### TOWN AND BOROUGH OF DEAL.

At a Common Assembly of the Deputy Mayor, Jurats, and Commonalty of the Town and Borough of Deal, in the County

of Kent, holden at the Guildhall there, the 30th March, 1809, it was resolved,

" That the Thanks of this Court be voted to Gwylym Lloyd Wardle, esq., M. P. for the very manly, spirited, and patriotic manner in which he has called the attention of the House of Commons to the Conduct of the Commander in Chief.

" That the Thanks of this Court be voted to William Honywood, esq., one of the Representatives in Parliament for this county, and likewise to Mr. Whitbread, lord Folkestone, and sir Francis Burdett, and the several other Members of the House of Commons who gave Mr. Wardle their assistance and support.

" That this Court beg to declare their firm attachment to their Sovereign and to the Constitution, but at the same time they cannot forbear to express that, as long as public abuses exist, the Country can never expect to enjoy the beneficial and happy effect of that constitution, which is the pride of Englishmen and the admiration of the world. This Court therefore humbly hopes that the honourable House of Commons will persevere in the investigation and reform of such abuses till corruption, which has been the downfall of other states, is fully rooted out, and the people may have the satisfaction of knowing and feeling that the sacrifices they make are for the public good, and not perverted to base or improper purposes.

" That those Resolutions be signed by the Town Clerk, and copies sent to G. L. Wardle, esq., and William Honywood, esq., M. P. and that the Resolutions be inserted in the Sun and Morning Chronicle, and in the county newspapers.

" Resolved, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to James Sharp, esq., Deputy Mayor, for his readiness in calling this Assembly (in the absence of the Mayor, who is from home) and for his impartial conduct in the Chair.

SAMPSON, Town Clerk."

#### CITY OF DURHAM.

At a Meeting of the Mayor, Aldermen, and Commonalty of the said City, holden at the Guildhall of the said City, the 5th day of April, 1809.

Resolved — That this Meeting having taken into consideration the patriotic and meritorious exertions of Gwylym Lloyd Wardle, esq. Member of Parliament, in originating and steadily supporting, in the honourable House of Commons, the recent Investigation of the Conduct of his Royal Highness, the late Commander in Chief, do

offer him their most sincere Thanks; and in testimony of the grateful sense which this Meeting feel of the spirited, firm, and upright manner, in which, amidst great discouragements, he instituted, conducted, and persevered in the Inquiry. That the Common Seal of this Ancient and Loyal City be affixed to this Resolution; and that the same be forthwith transmitted by the Mayor to Colonel Wardle.

And this Meeting having observed, with high approbation, the independent efforts of those Members of the House of Commons who assisted Col. Wardle in the progress of the Investigation, and who, on its termination, voted in favour of the Address moved by him, or of the Amendments proposed by Henry Bankes, esq. and Sir Thomas Turton, bart.; and also of those who divided against the Motion of the Right Honourable the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon that occasion: And this Meeting being of opinion, that efforts, at once honest and constitutional, and so well directed to promote the public welfare, should be rewarded with and should receive public support:

Resolved, therefore, That the grateful Thanks of this Meeting be, and they are hereby given to all those Members of the House of Commons who voted or divided in the Minority upon the Questions above adverted to :

That the thanks of this Meeting be given to Mr. Mayor for having convened, and for his conduct at the Meeting.

By Order, WILKINSON, Town Clerk.

Ordered—That these Resolutions be advertised in the Newcastle Chronicle and Courant, and in the Morning Chronicle and Courier Newspapers.

#### CITY OF LONDON, COMMON COUNCIL.

A Common Council, holden in the Chamber of the Guildhall of the City of London, on Thursday, the 6th day of April, 1809,

Resolved unanimously—That this Court has, on frequent occasions, evinced its detestation of the Public Abuses, which have been found to exist in various Departments of the State, and it cannot but equally condemn the corrupt practices developed by the late Investigation before the House of Parliament.

Resolved: That Gwyllym Lloyd Wardle, esq., having, unawed by Ministerial Threats, exhibited serious Charges against the late Commander in Chief, which have been clearly substantiated, and which have, in fact, induced his Royal Highness

to resign a situation of which he is unworthy, is entitled to the esteem and gratitude of this Court and the Country.

Resolved unanimously: That the Thanks of this Court and the Freedom of this City in a Gold Box, of the value of One Hundred Guineas, be presented to Gwyllym Lloyd Wardle, esq., in grateful testimony of the high sense they entertain of the zeal, intrepidity, and patriotism, which is so eminently evinced in that arduous and laudable undertaking.

Resolved: That the Thanks of this Court be presented to sir Francis Burdett, bart., (Seconder), lord Folkestone, Samuel Whitbread, esq., sir Samuel Romilly, knt., General Fergusson, Harvey Christian Combe, esq., Alderman, and one of the Representatives of this City in Parliament, and the rest of the 125 Independent Members who, upon the important question on the Conduct of his royal highness the Duke of York, attempted to stem the torrent of Corruption.

Resolved: That as a considerable number of those who voted in favour of the late Commander in Chief, on the 18th of March last, hold lucrative appointments at the pleasure of the Crown, a vote of acquittal under such circumstances must at all times appear extremely equivocal, but when given, as in the present instance, in direct contradiction to the evidence produced, which led to a decision so contrary to the legitimate expectations of the people, affords ground for apprehending that the decision has arisen from that preponderating influence of which this Court before has complained.

Resolved: That these and other Public Abuses call loudly for constitutional correction and redress, and evince the necessity of a radical and speedy reform, as essential to the safety and security of the just prerogative of the Crown as to the ancient and unalienable rights of the People.

Resolved: That the foregoing Resolutions be signed by the Town Clerk, and published in the Morning and Evening Papers.

WOODTHORPE.

#### COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX.

At a numerous Meeting of the Freeholders of the County of Middlesex, convened by the Sheriff, at the Mermaid at Hackney, the 11th day of April instant, pursuant to a Requisition, “ For the purpose of expressing the sentiments of the County on the Abuses which have been disclosed by the Investigation into the Con-

duct of the late Commander in Chief," the following Resolutions were adopted:—

1. That circumstances of public notoriety have, for a considerable time past, placed beyond all doubt the existence of gross and scandalous Abuses in various branches of the Executive Government of the Country.—Carried unanimously.

2. That the Abuses which have been found to prevail in all those departments of the Government in which inquiries have been instituted, have fully satisfied the Freeholders of this County of the necessity of further strict investigation into the remaining Public Departments of the State.—Carried unanimously.

3. That Gwylym Lloyd Wardle, Esq. by the unexampled courage, ability, and perseverance, with which he has pursued and completed an Inquiry into the conduct of the late Commander in Chief, has faithfully discharged the duties of a Member of Parliament, and has in an high degree merited the thanks and approbation of his Country.—Carried unanimously.

4. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Sir F. Burdett, bart. who seconded Col. Wardle's motion; to Lord Viscount Folkesone, for the active, uniform and able support which he afforded Mr. Wardle during the whole of the above Inquiry.—Carried unanimously.

5. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Samuel Whitbread, esq., Sir S. Romilly, Henry Martin, esq., Sir Thomas Turton, Major-General Ferguson, Thomas William Coke, esq., John Christian Curwen, esq., the hon. Thomas Brand, hon. W. H. Lyttleton, Lord Viscount Milton, Lord Viscount Althorpe, Charles Watkin William Wynde, esq., Lord Stanley, and the Minority of 125, who divided in favour of Mr. Wardle's Motion for an Address to the King on the subject of the late Inquiry.—Carried unanimously.

6. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the Minority of 137, who on the above occasion supported the Amendment proposed by Sir Thomas Turton, bart.—Carried.

7. That George Byng, esq. by the uniform, upright, and independent conduct which he has observed during the time he has represented the County of Middlesex, and more particularly by the support he gave Mr. Wardle on this occasion, has highly merited the Thanks and Approbation of this Meeting.—Carried unanimously.

8. That the conduct of Ministers in the House of Commons, during the course of

the late Inquiry, has been a complete dereliction of that duty, which, as Representatives of the People, they owe to their Constituents, and has proved them wholly unworthy of the confidence of the Country.—Carried unanimously.

9. That from the part which Ministers appear to have taken on the above occasion, no hopes can be reasonably entertained of any effectual reformation of evils so generally and loudly complained of, until the executive Departments of the State shall be entrusted to men who will honestly endeavour to detect, not shield abuses, and to whom the People may look up as the avengers, not the abettors of corruption.—Carried unanimously.

10. That it is the fervent hope of this Meeting that the people of the United Kingdom will be animated by the result of the late Inquiry to prosecute a Reform in all the departments of the State, by returning honest and independent Representatives, who shall faithfully and zealously exert themselves to correct and annihilate corruptions, which weaken and even endanger the existence of the Empire.—Carried unanimously.

11. That William Mellish, esq. one of the Representatives of this County, by his conduct in the late Inquiry, and generally since his election, has proved himself unworthy of the confidence of his Constituents.—Carried.

12. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the Sheriffs, for their prompt and constitutional compliance with the Requisition of the Freeholders to assemble this Meeting, and for their impartial conduct this day—Carried unanimously.

13. That these Resolutions be published in the Public Newspapers.

J. J. SMITH.—C. S. HUNTER, Sheriffs.

#### TOWN AND BOROUGH OF SOUTHWARK.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of the ancient Town and Borough of Southwark, April 12, 1800, John Townshend, Esq. Deputy Bailiff, in the Chair, in the absence of, and at the request of Sir Watkin Lewes, kt. High Bailiff.

1. Resolved, That the late Inquiry before the House of Commons, into the conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, as Commander-in-Chief, has exposed the most flagrant abuses in the administration of public affairs. It appears peculiarly alarming, that at a time when the Continent of Europe has been nearly overwhelmed by military power, such facts have been proved as tend to sully

the honour and damp the ardour of our brave Soldiers, and thereby threaten the safety and existence of the British Empire.—Passed unanimously.

2. That the Independence and Patriotism of Gwyllim Lloyd Wardle, esq. in the institution and conduct of the Inquiry, have eminently intitled him to the Thanks of this Meeting, and the gratitude of his Country ; and they trust that the result of such singular perseverance will encourage him, and every other honest Member, to detect and bring to question the Agents of Corruption in every department of the State.—Passed unanimously.

3. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Sir Francis Burdett, Lord Viscount Folkestone, Lord Milton, Lord Althorpe, Samuel Whitbread, esq., J. C. Curwen, esq., T. W. Coke, esq., Sir S. Romilly, kt., General Ferguson, and the rest of the 125 honest Members who voted in the Minority on Mr. Wardle's motion.—Passed unanimously.

4. That the hostile conduct of ministers threats of infamy against the hon. Member who proposed the Inquiry ; and above all the large majority who voted for the acquittal of the Duke, have convinced the Meeting, and, we trust, will convince the people of England, that a substantial Reform in the Representation of Parliament is the only barrier against corruption, and may afford some indemnity for the past, and security for the future.—Passed unanimously.

5. That the Thanks of the Meeting be given to Sir Thomas Turton, bart. and the 137 Members who voted for his Amendment. We observe, with pleasure, that he manifested an open hostility to corruption, in which, if he steadily and uniformly perseveres, he will insure the confidence and support of his Constituents.—Passed with only five dissentient.

6. That from a conviction that an honest Representation of the People in Parliament is the best and only security against the existence of abuses similar to those which have now been brought to light, we will, whenever we shall be called upon to exercise an Elective Franchise, support those only who shall pledge themselves worthy by a steady opposition to corruption, and a firm attachment to the pure and uncontaminated principles of the British Constitution.—Passed with a great majority.

7. That these Resolutions be printed in the Morning and Evening Papers.—Passed unanimously.

8. That the Thanks of the Meeting be given to Sir Watkin Lewes, the High Bailiff, for his readiness in convening the Town Hall.—Passed unanimously.

9. That the Thanks of the Meeting be given to John Townshend, esq. Deputy Bailiff, for his able and impartial conduct in the Chair.—Passed unanimously.

(Signed) JOHN TOWNSHEND, Dep. Bailiff.  
(To be continued.)

#### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

REVOLUTION IN SWEDEN.—*Address of the Duke of Sudermania, (Continued from page 544.)*

—A continental peace was on the point of being concluded at Tilsit, and Sweden invited to form one of the contracting parties ; Sweden refused ; and in consequence of this refusal she was compelled to fight France, and her numerous allies, single-handed, on the Continent of Europe, and the siege of Stralsund was carried on with increased vigour. Even during that siege, nay, after the conclusion of the convention, which stipulated the evacuation of Pomerania and Rugen by our troops, offers of peace were made by the enemy, and rejected ; and the German possessions of Sweden, the last remains of the conquests of Gustavus Adolphus the Great, were lost. Sweden had, however, to sustain losses still more severe. The winter of 1807, and the following year, serious apprehensions arose of an impending rupture with our neighbours, both on the East and West of our empire.—These apprehensions and dangers might have been warded off a few months before by the Swedish government, by its accession to the Peace of Tilsit ; a peace which Sweden was not prevented from concluding by her only ally, which was offered on terms by no means irreconcileable with the public interest of Sweden.—The war broke out in Finland, and its gallant defenders, at the end of a severe and honourable conflict, with an enemy far superior in number, were obliged to give up to him their beloved country. This misfortune, the most calamitous event which has befallen Sweden for centuries past, might have been avoided, if the powerful preparations of defence, which the situation and nature of the country admitted, had been conducted with wisdom and skill, and if the plans of resistance, no sooner adopted than relinquished, had been conceived and carried into effect, with unity and firmness. Finland, which, in point of population and intrinsic value,

formed one third part of the Swedish Empire, was lost, and this loss bore with the most destructive pressure on the two remaining thirds.—In this state of affairs, the means of waging war against such numerous enemies could not prove sufficient for any length of time, and no other resource was left than to burden with new taxes a people unable to bear them. The public necessities increased in proportion as the means and resources of the State were destroyed. Trade and navigation were at a stand; our mines and agriculture were unproductive from want of hands; universal ruin was spreading wide and far; and yet it was universally known that His Royal Majesty had again repeated his former firm and unalterable determination not to conclude a peace with the present Government of France, without which, however, no reconciliation with Denmark and Russia could take place.—In this situation of affairs a considerable part of the Western army formed a resolution to march to the capital with the patriotic view which appears by the Proclamation issued on their part. Similar movements took place among the rest of the Swedish troops, and it was in this critical position his Royal Majesty came to the unfortunate resolution of leaving Stockholm, and directing his family, and several officers of the state, to follow him. The garrison was ordered to file off, and it was intended to assemble an army in the South, to oppose the troops who were approaching from the North and West. Two distinct governments were thus to be formed, two armies to be assembled, and a civil war was to fill up the measure of our calamities and distress—The King's departure was, however, postponed until the 13th of March, at noon. An universal consternation prevailed. The most respectful remonstrances against his Majesty's determination were rejected, and no other means remained even to secure the safety of the King's own person, than to prevent him from carrying his unfortunate resolve into effect. In these circumstances all the officers of state, in conjunction with the states of the Empire, who were present in Stockholm, expressed to his Royal Highness the constitutional wish that he might take the reins of government into his hands; a wish to which his Royal Highness, notwithstanding his advanced age, thought himself in duty bound to accede, confiding that this step will be viewed in its proper light by every honest patriotic Swede.

SIR JOHN MOORE.—The following Extract from the last Letter of General Sir John Moore has been printed, in pursuance of the order of the House of Commons:

*Extract of a Letter from Lieutenant-General Sir John Moore, to Viscount Castlereagh; dated Corunna, Jan. 13.*

“ Situated as this army is at present, it is impossible for me to detail to your Lordship the events which have taken place since I had the honour to address you from Astorga, on the 31st of December: I have therefore determined to send to England Brigadier-General Charles Stewart, as the Officer best qualified to give you every information you can want, both with respect to our actual situation and the events which have led to it.—Your Lordship knows, that had I followed my own opinion, as a military man, I should have retired with the army from Salamanca. The Spanish armies were then beaten; there was no Spanish force to which we could unite, and I was satisfied that no efforts would be made to aid us, or to favour the cause in which they were engaged.—I was sensible, however, that the apathy and indifference of the Spaniards would never have been believed; that had the British been withdrawn, the loss of the cause would have been imputed to their retreat, and it was necessary to risk this army to convince the people of England, as well as the rest of Europe, that the Spaniards had neither the power nor the inclination to make any efforts for themselves. It was for this reason that I made the march to Sahagan. As a diversion it succeeded: I brought the whole disposable force of the French against this army, and it has been allowed to follow me, without a single movement being made to favour my retreat. The people of the Galicias, though armed, made no attempt to stop the passage of the French through the mountains. They abandoned their dwellings at our approach, drove away their carts, oxen, and every thing that could be of the smallest aid to the army. The consequence has been, that our sick have been left behind; and when our horses or mules failed, which on such marches, and through such a country, was the case to a great extent, baggage, ammunition, stores, &c. and even money, were necessarily destroyed or abandoned.—I am sorry to say, that the army, whose conduct I had such reason to extol on its march through Portugal, and on its arrival in Spain, has totally changed

its character since it began to retreat. I can say nothing in its favour, but that when there was a prospect of fighting the enemy, the men were then orderly and seemed pleased and determined to do their duty. In front of Villa Franca the French came up with the reserve, with which I was covering the retreat of the army; they attacked it at Calcabellos. I retired, covered by the 95th Regiment, and marched that night to Herresias, and from thence to Nogales and Lugo, where I had ordered the different divisions which preceded, to halt and collect. At Lugo, the French again came up with us. They attacked our advanced posts on the 6th and 7th, and were repulsed in both attempts, with little loss on our side. I heard from the prisoners taken, that three divisions of the French army were come up commanded by Marshal Soult; I therefore expected to be attacked on the morning of the 8th. It was my wish to come to that issue; I had perfect confidence in the valour of the troops, and it was only by crippling the enemy that we could hope either to retreat or to embark unmolested. I made every preparation to receive the attack, and drew out the army in the morning to offer battle. This was not Marshal Soult's object. He either did not think himself sufficiently strong, or he wished to play a surer game by attacking us on our march, or during our embarkation. The country was intersected, and his position too strong for me to attack with an inferior force. The want of provisions would not enable me to wait longer; I marched that night; and in two forced marches by advancing for six or eight hours in the rain, I reached Betanzos on the 10th instant.—At Lugo, I was sensible of the impossibility of reaching Vigo, which was at too great a distance, and offered no advantages to embark in the face of an enemy. My intention was then to have retreated to the peninsula of Betanzos, where I hoped to find a position to cover the embarkation of the army in Ares or Redes Bays; but having sent an Officer to reconnoitre it, by his report I was determined to prefer this place. I gave notice to the Admiral of my intention, and begged that the transports might be brought to Corunna; had I found them here on my arrival, on the 11th, the embarkation would easily have been effected, for I had gained several marches on the French. They have now come up with us, the transports are not arrived; my position in front of this place is a very bad one;

and this place, if I am forced to retire into it, is commanded within musket shot, and the harbour will be so commanded by cannon on the coast, that no ship will be able to lay in it. In short, my Lord, General Stewart will inform you how critical our situation is. It has been recommended to me to make a proposal to the enemy, to induce him to allow us to embark quietly; in which case he gets us out of the country soon, and this place, with its stores, &c. complete; that otherwise we have the power to make a long defence, which must cause the destruction of the town. I am averse to make any such proposal, and am exceedingly doubtful if it would be attended with any good effect; but whatever I resolve on this head, I hope your Lordship will rest assured, that I shall accept no terms that are in the least dishonourable to the army or to the country. I find I have been led into greater length, and more detail, than I thought I should have had time for; I have written under interruptions, and my mind much occupied with other matter. My letter, written so carelessly, can only be considered as private. When I have more leisure, I shall write more correctly; in the mean time, I rely on General Stewart for giving your Lordship the information and detail which I have omitted. I should regret his absence, for his services have been very distinguished; but the state of his eyes makes it impossible for him to serve, and this country is not one in which cavalry can be of much use. If I succeed in embarking the army, I shall send it to England; it is quite unfit for further service until it has been refitted, which can best be done there.

JOHN MOORE."

PORTUGAL.—His Royal Highness the Prince Regent has appointed General William Car Beresford, Field Marshal and Commander in Chief of the Portuguese army. It appears from an Extraordinary Gazette, published at Seville on the 1st inst. that the division of Spanish troops commanded by the Duke of Alberquerque, was attacked on the 22d ult. in the position of Consavigra, by a French force of 11,000 foot and 3000 horse; which attack was made with the enemy's usual impetuosity, but completely failed, owing to the uncommon intrepidity displayed by the Spanish troops. The French were repulsed and defeated with the loss of upwards of 400 men.—Field Marshal Beres-

ford has issued the following GENERAL ORDERS:

" His Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Portugal having most graciously been pleased to entrust to Field Marshal Beresford the command in chief of his armies, thinks it right, on assuming the said command, to state and declare to his comrades in arms his sentiments on this occasion.—The Field Marshal and Commander in Chief, during the time he served in the army which was sent by his Britannic Majesty to support the admirable and prodigious efforts made by the Portuguese to recover their liberty and independence, so unjustly attacked, had an opportunity of becoming intimately acquainted with the military character of the nation ; and although he thinks he has given the most effectual proofs of the favourable idea he had formed of that character, by accepting the above command, yet he wishes and hopes to prove, in a more decisive manner, that the command in chief of the Portuguese army could not have possibly been confided to any other Officer so thoroughly convinced of the innate military talents and disposition of the Portuguese, who want nothing but some skill and uniformity of plan in the direction of their warlike energies, to prove that they still are what they have always been, if not the best soldiers, at least equal to the most valiant and most intrepid troops of Europe. The Field-Marshal Commander in Chief will therefore exert himself with incessant zeal and application to render those qualities as efficient as they are accustomed to be when they are assisted by a strict and well-regulated discipline. It is universally acknowledged that the Portuguese are loyal to their Sovereign, obedient to their lawful authorities who represent him, and endure, without murmurs, the privations and inconveniences to which armies must frequently submit. The patriotism, energy, and enthusiasm, of which they have but very lately given the most unquestionable proofs; the glory which they acquired in Roussillon, and the successes which they obtained on the northern frontiers, clearly shew their determined intrepidity and valour, qualities which cannot but render them worthy of their ancestors, and as famous as them.—No nation, Portuguese, is therefore better qualified than you are to form the best troops. The Field-Marshal, Commander in Chief, convinced of this truth, finds himself, with the utmost pleasure, identified with the Portuguese nation. He is a Portuguese Officer, and confides to

the Portuguese his character and honour, perfectly satisfied that they will be preserved unimpaired, and returned to him with gain.—The Field-Marshal, Commander in Chief, deems it necessary to assure you, that he will at all times consider it as one of his most important duties, to raise and reward merit, whenever he shall meet with it, and that the only recommendation he shall notice, will be that derived from zeal, activity, skill, valour, and patriotism, qualities which shall at all times find in him a sure and zealous protector.

The Field-Marshal, Commander in Chief, calls the attention of all the General and Subaltern Officers to the present state and improvement of the army, and being convinced that the best method of introducing discipline and a strict observance of duty into a military corps consists in the example set by the Officers, he hopes they will never fail to give their men a lesson so necessary and important. The Field-Marshal Commander-in Chief feels anxious to embrace the earliest opportunity of inspecting the different corps which have already taken the field, as well as the rest of the army ; and he shall avail himself of all occasions which offer to promote the satisfaction, decorum, and advantage of the officers and soldiers who are entrusted to his care.—Dated, Head Quarters, Lisbon, the 13th March 1809."

HOLLAND.—*From the Royal Courant, published at Amsterdam on the 4th Inst.*

Louis Napoleon, by the grace of God, and the Constitution of the kingdom, King of Holland, and Constable of France, taking into consideration that the term prescribed by our Decree of the 27th of November, 1808, No. 5, expires on the 31st instant. Taking further into consideration that it is necessary, at the present period, to take further measures, either for the renewal of the aforesaid Decree, or the previous Decrees respecting the means of carrying into execution the prohibition of all commerce with the enemy, or of replacing them, in whole or part, by other measures calculated to place all matters relative to navigation on a footing of complete uniformity with the Decree of France and of our Brother the Emperor; and notwithstanding the difficulties arising from the maritime war, and those which commerce suffers for its own interest, being continually anxious to contribute to that important object, we have decreed and hereby decree—

Art. 1. All commerce, correspondence,

and communication with England, remains prohibited according to the purport of our previous Laws, Decrees, and Regulations, and particularly such of them as expired on the 21st instant, so far as no alteration is therein made by the present decree.

2. From the first day of the succeeding month of April, the following fifty-two articles may be exported to friendly or neutral countries in Dutch vessels, or those sailing under the flag of neutral or allied powers, viz.

Books, beans, butter, brandy, bricks, white lead, cheese, cambricks, copper manufactured, clocks, clover and garden seeds, eels, flower roots, fruits, geneva, gauzes, glue, hoops, hides dried, iron manufactured, leather, linen, linseed, madders, mill-stones, oak bark, ground oats, oils of seed, pottery, powder blue, peas, paper, perfumery, plants, pipes, playing cards, quills, rushes, silk manufactured, saech. saturni, starch, tiles, thread and thread-tape, tobacco, tarras, turf, vinegar, watches, wine, wood manufactured.

3. The Importation of the following 32 articles shall be permitted, viz. .

Brandy, ashes (pot), candles, copper, corn, fish-oil, isinglass, hare-skin, hemp and hemp seed, hides (rough), iron, leather (unmanufactured), lead, linseed, mercury, mats, pitch, Russia skins, rape-seed, stock-fish, soda, tar, tallow, tobacco, timber, wax-wool, wool, bristles, and fruit.

4. The commodities prepared for exportation shall not be put on board until previous notice has been given thereof to the Marine Director of the Ways and Means, with a particular specification of such articles, which cannot be exported but from the ports of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Dordrecht, Groningen, Embden, Harlingen, Veere, Zierikzee, Delfzil and Brouwershaven.

5. In order to the admission of any vessels into the harbours of this kingdom, they must enter in ballast or laden with the products of the north, specified in the third Article, with the exception alone of such vessels as are laden with salt, or those which in the years 1806 or 1807 obtained our licence to proceed to China for a cargo of tea, upon shewing our said authority.

6. No other goods than those mentioned in the 4th Article shall be suffered to

be imported under any pretence whatever; all prohibited goods of whatever description, and in whatsoever quantity imported, and also the vessels on board which they may be found, being hereby declared liable to confiscation.

7. In case of suspicions arising respecting the origin of the cargo from informations received by the officers of the Marine Director, the same shall be provisionally sequestered until proof be given that it has not come from England or her colonies.

8. Our Consuls in giving certificates of origin for goods shipped at their ports of residence for Dutch Ports, shall not confine themselves to certifying that the goods neither come from England nor her colonies, nor belong to English commerce, but they shall further specify the place from whence the goods originally came, the documents produced to them in proof of the respective declarations, and the names of the vessels in which they were conveyed from the place of origin to the port where the Consuls reside. They are required to transmit a copy of the said declarations to our Marine Director.

[The remaining eight Articles relate merely to the details of the manner in which the above Articles are to be carried into execution, by the Marine Director and the three Naval Commanders of the Coast Districts. The Decree is dated at Utrecht, on the 31st of March.]

#### SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Decree of the Supreme Junta.*

His Majesty, considering that the French, in the unjust and barbarous war which they wage against Spain, pay no regard to any principle of the laws of nations—that they shamelessly violate the most solemn treaties, as has been verified with respect to the capitulation of Madrid, since, contrary to the stipulations therein made, they imprison, persecute, and banish peaceable Citizens and respectable Magistrates, imposing, at the same time, the most disgraceful punishments on other unfortunate persons on the slightest suspicions and most frivolous pretexts.—Seeing that they continue every where to desile the sanctity of temples, the purity of domestic honour, and to trample on the rights of humanity

(To be continued.)

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 16.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1809.

[Price 1s.

"Lord CASTLEREAGH supported the opinion, that such a CONSPIRACY did exist, with the determined object of running down the characters of the princes of the blood, and through them to destroy the monarchical branch of the constitution. Having failed in the attempt to injure it by open force, they now proceeded to sap and undermine it by the diffusion of seditious libels, converting the noble attributes of a free press to the most dangerous and detestable purposes. H. r. b. the Commander in Chief was the principal object of their rancorous invective. To his prejudice facts were falsified, and motives attributed to him of which his very nature was incapable. As to the observation of the hon. gent. that the crown lawyers had not done their duty in not prosecuting libellers, he had only to say, that it was not always easy to convict upon an obvious libel, as a very small portion of legal knowledge united with some ingenuity, would be sufficient to defeat a prosecution."—*Speech of 27th Jan. 1809, when Mr. Wardle made his Charges.*

577] [578

## SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

LORD CASTLEREAGH.—"Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof;" and, in spite of my most anxious wish to put upon record, in the Register, the remaining Cases of the York Inquiry, other matter, of the same sort, presses forward continually upon me, and, with new and irresistible claims, contends for the preference. Amongst all the cases, however, which demand immediate notice, that of this Lord Castlereagh, is certainly entitled to the first place.—But, before I enter upon it I must explain some circumstances, which may not be generally known.—The case is that of a transaction of proffered *barter*; in which, as the dealers in live-stock term it, a *swap* was intended to be made of an East India *Writership* for a *Seat in the House of Commons*.—Now, reader, you should be informed, that a *Writership* is an office under the East India Company, of which offices there are many, and which are all bestowed by the East India *Directors*, who are a kind of ministers, or rulers, in the affairs of the Company. The people of England pay, though in a circuitous way, all the salaries of these *Writers* and for all that is gained by all the persons, who go to India and get rich there. So that, when you see what is called a *Nabob* come and settle in this country, you see a man who has got all his means out of the *taxes* raised in England, the East India establishment being, like many other establishments, nothing more than a round-about channel, through which the fruits of the general labour and incomes of the people go into the pockets of individuals. This fact it will be necessary for you to bear in mind, in order to be able to form a correct judgment as to how you and your family and neighbours are affected by the abuse of which I am about to speak somewhat in detail.—The East

India *Directors* are *sworn* not to sell *Writerships*; but, to dispose of those offices for the good of the service, and to such persons, of course, as are well qualified, from their probity, as well as their talents, to fill places of great trust and confidence. These *Writers* are clerks, sent out to India, where they have the management of the Company's business; where they *collect taxes* from the people; and where, when they arrive at high situations, they exercise great and fearful authority over the people.—You will allow, that it is very fitting, that persons, who are to fill such posts, should not be needy and greedy adventurers; that they should be men of honour as well as men of sense; and, that they should come recommended by these qualities, and not by a sum of money, in the shape of a bribe.—This is what ought to be; and, the principle, indeed the law is, that this shall be, and, to secure the fulfilment of the law, the *Directors* are even *sworn* not to sell any of these offices.—How far the practice has corresponded with the theory, you will soon see; and, I beg you not to be surprized, if you find the affairs of the East India Company to exhibit symptoms very little better, than those exhibited in the affairs of the army, as connected with the establishment in Gloucester Place.—It will not be forgotten, that, when DONOVAN (our old friend, Donovan!) came to be examined at the bar of the House of Commons, it appeared, that he had been concerned in the *Sale of Writerships*, as well as of military commissions and promotions. The East India *Directors*, many of whom, to our great misfortune, are in the House, seemed thunderstruck at the fact; well knowing that they were *sworn* not to sell any such offices. At this I, for my part, was quite surprized, seeing that, for many

years past, these offices, both *Writerships* and *Cadetships* (the latter being a military office in the East Indies) have been *advertised* for sale, or for purchase, in every news-paper in the kingdom, just in the same way and with as little disguise, as horses or houses are advertised.—Nevertheless, as the thing was come out, there was no shuffling it off. Inquiry was called for in the East India department as well as in that of the army; and Mrs. Clarke having given the ministers a pretty good sample of the effects of their examinations at the *bar* of the House, it was resolved to form a distinct Committee, in a separate apartment of the House, for the purpose of prosecuting this Inquiry. The Committee, so appointed, made their Report on the 23rd of March, which Report, together with the Evidence, consisting of 235 folio pages, I have now before me.

—From this valuable book, it appears, that, though there be no positive proof of the Directors having actually sold any of the offices, which they had taken an oath not to sell; yet, that they *gave* them to persons, who did *sell* them, and to persons, too, whom they must have known to be incapable of filling the offices themselves. For instance, the Director THELLUSON gave *three* writerships to MR. WOODFORD, his cousin. Mr. Woodford sold the first for 3,500*l.* the second for 3,000*l.* and he disposed of the third to a MR. TAHOURDIN, upon the latter undertaking to procure, for a friend of Mr. Woodford, the next presentation to a *church living* of the value of 300*l.* a year.—The public have seen Mr. Woodford's statement, and to that I refer them, for the present, it being my object now to fix the attention of the reader to the Case of LORD CASTLEREAGH.

—By-and-by, when I come to lay other cases before the public, the Reverend DR. LOCKE of Farnham in Surrey (my native town,) and a Reverend THOMAS LLOYD, will be seen purchasing and selling Cadetships, and, of course, will take their proper place upon the list with the Clergymen, whom Mrs. Clarke's affair introduced to a burthened and insulted nation.—I have said that the Directors are not, in these papers, proved to have sold the places themselves; but, that they are proved to have given them to persons who did sell them, or swap them away. We shall, in a future article upon the subject, see some other great names introduced; but, at present we must confine ourselves to Lord CASTLEREAGH; to Lord Castlereagh, who and whose family, have, within the last

thirty years, swallowed millions of the public money; to Lord Castlereagh, who is now Secretary of State for the War department, and, of course, one of the chief *advisers of the King*; to Lord Castlereagh, who is a colleague of that Mr. Perceval, who prosecuted the Plymouth Tinman; to Lord Castlereagh, who made the Speech, an extract of which I have taken for my motto; to Lord Castlereagh, who, upon Mr. Wardle's bringing forward his charges, was the loudest amongst those, who cried out “Jacobin Conspiracy,” and who stated “the difficulties of producing *con-viction* in cases of *libel*;” to Lord Castlereagh, whom the Irish have such good reason to remember, and with whom I hope to make every man in England acquainted: Others anon; every one in his turn; but, first of all, let us confine ourselves, let us direct our undivided attention, to the Case of Lord Castlereagh.—This being a case of such importance; it being a case that so clearly exposes to our view the manner, in which *Scats in Parliament* are bargained for; it being a case that goes to the very root of all the evils we suffer; all our miseries and all our shame; it being such a case as this, I shall give the whole of the Evidence relating to it. The witnesses are only *three*; namely, a MR. REDING, Lord CLANCARTY, and Lord CASTLEREAGH himself.—I beg the reader to go patiently through all this Evidence. A great deal of it is not *directly* to the main point; but the whole of it is deeply interesting. Observe how familiarly REDING and even the two *Lords* talk of the *truck*. Observe how intimate Reding was with the MARQ. OF SLIGO, and how freely he speaks of the *amounts* of the *Writership* and the *Seat*. You will see that REDING produces several letters from the Marquis of Sligo to him; and that he talks of the Marquis's *sole property* in the *Seat*. You see him negotiating with the two *Lords* about the swap with as much ease as any two of us negotiate about the swap for a horse or a cow. From these little incidents we get the true picture, the life, of the thing; ay, the true picture of our unparalleled degradation.

#### MR. REDING'S EVIDENCE.

“What was the understood condition of this agreement?—That if the one had not the *Seat*, the other was not to have the *Writership*; that was the way I understood it.

Through whose means was the *Writership* to be procured?—I beg to ask permission, if it is not too great a favour, to wait till I examine my accounts.

Answer to the best of your recollection.—This Writership was to be received from one of the members of the Board of Controul originally. It is a thing that I have no wish to displease this house in, in any shape whatever, but it is hard I should be obliged to disclose the secrets.

It is necessary you should disclose every thing you know; through which of the members of the Board of Controul did you understand this appointment was to be obtained?—The earl of Clancarty.

How did you know it was to be obtained through his means?—I waited upon his lordship, and he wrote to me afterwards to come to him. I wrote to another nobleman, a friend of mine.

Who was that other nobleman?—That nobleman is now dead; it was the marquis of Sligo.

You wrote to him?—I had the honour of being very intimate with him; I told him, if this one thing could be done, I would manage to assist his friend to get the other.

Which was to be got for his friend, the Writership, or the Seat in Parliament?—The Seat in Parliament.

Did he give you any letter to lord Clancarty?—None; the marquis of Sligo called at my house at different times, and we conversed upon this subject, and I received a letter to come to the Board of Controul.

From whom was that letter?—Lord Clancarty. Before I obeyed this note, I waited upon the marquis of Sligo, and told him I had a letter; he said, I know you have, it is my man. I did not know lord Clancarty at that time. In consequence of this letter, I came to the Board of Controul, and several steps of negotiation took place respecting this Seat and this Thing. I did not know that I was doing wrong, for it was not selling the Seat.

What conversation passed between you and lord Clancarty?—We have had so many conversations, that, without reference to my documents, I cannot say; I have many of his notes.

Have you notes relating to this transaction now in your possession?—He does not say any thing further in the notes, but only desiring I will call at such a time.

Then how will looking at those notes enable you to communicate any circumstances to the committee which you cannot now?—Because I generally made some remarks and private memorandums, to see where I had to answer, where I had to wait. Perhaps I had a dozen letters or

more, from different people, when I came home.

Did the transaction break off upon this conversation?—It did.

Had you any subsequent conversation on the same subject with lord Clancarty?—I do not think I had, for I understood this man of the name of Davies made a piece of work about it, and I never spoke to Davies; I would not speak in the street, and I desired my servants, if he came, never to let him come into the house. When I met lord Clancarty since, he has said, how do you do, Mr. Reding, nothing more.

Is this a true account of the termination of that transaction?—It is, as far as I can recollect.

Did you mention to lord Clancarty the name of the person for whom you wished this appointment to be obtained in India? I really do not know whether I did or did not.

Recollect yourself.—I have not the power to satisfy myself, whether I did or did not.

Who was the person for whom you wished to procure the appointment?—A Mr. Ogg.

Who is Mr. Ogg?—He is a young gentleman who lived in Gloucester-street, or Devonshire-street, Queen-square, Bloomsbury.

How was he known to you?—He is known to me through the interference of Mr. Davies, of Northumberland-street.

What sum of money was Mr. Ogg to give you for procuring this appointment?—I understood from Mr. Ogg at first it was to be 3,000*l.* at least, from Mr. Davies, then on going to Lloyd's Coffee-house, I found it was to be 3,500*l.* I told them they were all a set of shufflers, for there was a larger sum of money than I knew any thing about, and I would have nothing more to do with it: whether it was pounds or guineas, I do not recollect.

Did your transaction with Mr. Ogg break off in consequence of this circumstance?—No, it did not, my transaction with Mr. Ogg broke off in consequence of lord Clancarty being offended, and I being offended; and besides that, I understood that this man of the name of Davies sent some papers to lord Clancarty, on which I concluded, and all parties concluded, it was most prudent to drop further negotiation upon the subject.

Was any money deposited by Mr. Ogg?—Never; not to me or any body, that I know of.

Were you to receive the whole sum of 3,000*l.* or guineas from Mr. Ogg?—From his friends I was to receive it; but it was not to be put into my pocket, though for the moment I was to receive it, it was to be given in different ways.

In what ways was it to be divided, and between whom?—Some part was to go for agency to Davies.

What part was he to have?—I never mentioned to him to have more than common commission at five per-cent.; another part was to be given to a relation of Mrs. Grove.

What relation?—I do not know how nearly related this young lady was to her.

What was her name?—I am not positive, without looking to documents which I did not think I should want to-day. —

What was to be done with the remainder?—Part of it was commission to me.

What part of the sum of 3,000 guineas or pounds had you, distinct to yourself?—A commission.

At the rate of five per-cent.?—Yes; if my friend chose to make a present of more, I should not say a word against it.

Was a commission at five per-cent. upon 3,000*l.* or guineas, all that you expected in return for returning a Member to Parliament?—That was all that I expected to have eventually for myself; if my friend wished to do me any other service, I was very willing to obey his commands.

Was Mr. Ogg, who was to receive the appointment to the East Indies, to pay any more than 3,000 guineas or pounds?—I understood, when I went to Lloyd's Coffee-house, that he was to pay 500 pounds or guineas more, on which I turned my back on all the parties; I would not have any thing more to do with Davies, because I found he meant to deceive me and the parties.

What other parties were concerned, besides Davies?—Mr. Livie, the brother-in-law of Mr. Ogg.

Do you mean, in saying you turned your back upon all the parties, that you turned your back upon Mr. Davies and Mr. Livie?—Yes.

Was there any body besides?—Mr. Ogg was in the room with us.

Did you not continue your negotiation with Mr. Ogg upon this subject?—Mr. Ogg called at my house at different times, and his sister, Mrs. Livie; I did not ever after speak a word to Mr. Davies.

Did the negotiation go on with Mr. Ogg after this time or not?—It died away in

the manner I have stated, in consequence of what passed with lord Clancarty.

Did it die away in consequence of your turning your back upon these parties?—From the circumstance of this Mr. Davies sending to lord Clancarty, I was afraid all our names would be exposed, and I dropped all further negotiation with him.

Did you drop all further negotiation with Mr. Ogg?—Mr. Ogg and I had no further business, from that period to the present.

Was the whole advantage you expected to derive to yourself for returning a Member to Parliament, a commission of five per-cent. upon 3000*l.* or guineas?—I did not even wish that, or ask that at the time; I would do that without, to oblige my friend, without a shilling, and be at any expence to serve him.

What friend are you speaking of?—Lord Sligo.

How could lord Sligo be benefited by returning a Member to Parliament who was a stranger to him?—That was within his own breast; I cannot account for that.

How could you suppose he would be obliged by making such a return to parliament?—He had given me those directions, and I complied with them.

What directions did he give to you?—To negotiate with lord Clancarty.

Was lord Sligo interested in the appointment of Mr. Ogg to India?—How far that was, I cannot answer.

Did you ever hear lord Sligo mention the name of Mr. Ogg?—Lord Sligo and I at various times talked of Mr. Ogg's name without reserve, when I have had the honour of being with him in his room.

Did you first mention the name of Mr. Ogg to lord Sligo, or lord Sligo to you?—I cannot answer that, it is out of my power.

By whom was the name of Mr. Ogg first mentioned to you?—By Mrs. Grove, I think.

Have you any reason to believe that Mr. Ogg was acquainted with lord Sligo?—I do not know; I cannot say that Mr. Ogg was acquainted with lord Sligo, nor I cannot take upon myself to say he was not.

Did you ever see him in company with lord Sligo?—Never.

Did you ever hear lord Sligo talk of him as an acquaintance?—No; I do not suppose lord Shgo would be acquainted with a man, unless it was his own particular friend.

What benefit could lord Sligo derive

from Mr. Ogg's appointment to India?—That I cannot answer.

Was he to receive any part of the 3,000*l.* or guineas?—I do not know that he was.

Do you know that he was not?—I do not know that he was not.

In your answer relating to the distribution of this money, why did you not include the name of lord Sligo, if he was to receive any part of the money?—I do not know now that he was to receive any part of the money.

Did he know what sum was to be paid by Mr. Ogg for the Writership?—I told him. I was with lord Sligo almost every morning; three and four times in the day, and there was not a thing kept unknown from his lordship by myself.

Did you tell him into what shares that money was intended to be divided?—I do not know at this moment whether I have or have not; I would with pleasure tell if I could; perhaps I may find some memorandum by and by, that would throw light upon it. Here are lord Sligo's notes to me.

Did you at any time communicate to lord Sligo that he was to derive any pecuniary advantage in consequence of returning lord Clancarty to parliament?—I always told lord Sligo what was doing: I do not know that I have exactly told him in what way the money was to be divided, or in what shares; I do not remember that I have.

Did you ever see lord Sligo in company with Mrs. Grove?—I do not know that I have; but I was very intimate with the late lord Hawarden, and I have seen the late lord Hawarden in company with lord Sligo, and we have talked on the subject.

On what subject did you talk with lord Hawarden?—On the subject of the return of lord Clancarty to parliament; at that period lord Hawarden wished to go to parliament himself, but he had not it in his power to do that that he wanted to do as a return.

Did you mention the circumstance to lord Hawarden in the presence of lord Sligo?—I was very intimate with lord Hawarden at that period, and had the honour of visiting him, and he visited me, and I told him one morning when he called upon me, that I thought it was in my power to do him that service, and that I would in preference to a gentleman that I knew nothing of; but I believe I did not know at that period, and I asked him whether he would influence his relations, the arch-

bishop his father-in-law, or any other relation, to get a similar thing; I had meetings two or three times upon it, and he told me he could not do it, and I told lord Sligo the same.

Did you communicate to lord Hawarden that you had the disposal of one of lord Sligo's Seats in Parliament?—I did not make use of any such language, but that I thought I had it in my power to do him a service in that way.

Do you know what part of the three thousand pounds or guineas lord Sligo expected to receive for returning lord Clancarty to parliament?—I am at a loss how to answer that question.

What benefit was he to derive from returning lord Clancarty to parliament?—I cannot answer what benefit he was to derive.

Had lord Sligo any conversation with lord Clancarty in your presence?—Lord Clancarty came in one day, to lord Sligo's house, and said when the servant announced his name, here is Mr. Reding; and lord Clancarty asked me how I was, and asked me if I knew a Mrs. somebody, I do not know the name now; I told him I did not; and on the next day, or in a day or two I received an anonymous letter which I suspected came from this very Mr. Davies, lord Sligo was then gone to Ireland; I wrote to him in Ireland, and here is his lordship's answer to that.

Had lord Sligo any conversation with lord Clancarty in your presence?—He had, so far as that, coming in one morning to lord Sligo's house.

Did any conversation pass at that time on the subject of this transaction?—All that I recollect was, lord Clancarty asked me, Do you know a Mrs. somebody; I answered that I did not know such a name; and I took for granted that something unpleasant had occurred from his mentioning a name that I did not know any thing about.

How could his mentioning a name that you knew nothing about, give you to understand that something unpleasant had occurred?—Because I did not know the name of this person, and at that time lord Clancarty had done almost with the negotiation; we had dropped it.

Did not you say before, that you had never seen lord Clancarty so as to converse with him, after this negotiation was dropped?—I said I did not see lord Castlereagh; I do not conceive now that it is exactly the same subject; he asked me, at lord Sligo's, whether I knew a Mrs.

somebody, Tipper or some such name, and I told him I did not know such a person. If that is entering into the merits of the thing again, I cannot say as to that. In a few days after this, I received an anonymous letter, threatening that lord Clancarty, lord Sligo, and Mr. Livie and myself, should be exposed, and I took it for granted this threatening letter came from that fellow of the name of Davies, and I never answered it, I took no notice of it; I made some particular inquiries as to the hand-writing, and I took it for granted it was this fellow of the name of Davies; I wrote to lord Sligo, and here is his lordship's answer.

[The letter read, dated the 11th August 1806.]

Do you know lord Sligo's hand-writing? I do; that is his hand-writing, and all those are his hand-writing.

[Note from the marquis of Sligo, dated Grafton-street, Wednesday, read.]

To what place does that allude?—I should imagine, but I will not be positive, the Seat.

Do you not know what it alludes to?—No, I have very few things with me; this is all I could get at; perhaps I may at some future period find some more, which will explain it.

Cannot you take upon yourself to say whether the place to be vacated means a Seat in Parliament or not?—I should imagine it means that.

Who was to vacate that Seat?—I do not know.

Was it a Seat of lord Sligo's?—I do not know whether lord Sligo had any Seats, it was through his influence.

[Note from the marquis of Sligo, dated Grafton-street, Saturday, read.]

[Note from the marquis of Sligo, dated Grafton-street, Thursday, read.]

[Note from the marquis of Sligo, dated Grafton-street, without date, read.]

[Note from the marquis of Sligo, dated Wednesday, read.]

[Note from the marquis of Sligo, dated Thursday, read.]

Are those all the notes you could find of lord Sligo's?—Those are all that I could find in my room now.

What Seat was it that you thought you had it in your power to obtain for lord Clancarty?—I cannot tell where the Seat was, for I never asked lord Sligo; it was through the interest of my friend lord Sligo; I took his word, and offered to pledge myself for every thing he should say, when I said I would enter into a bond

with lord Clancarty.

Were you in habits of great intimacy with lord Sligo?—Yes.

How long have you known him?—Some years.

How long before this transaction?—It may be three or four years, I cannot exactly say.

Do you conceive you were a person much trusted by him?—I never asked lord Sligo to trust me with any thing, his politeness to me was great at all times, he placed his confidence, as you see, in me; I never petitioned for any thing of the kind.

Did you consider him as reposing confidence in you?—I have no doubt that he would pay every reasonable respect to me that may be paid to a man not equal to him in rank, but a man in a middling sphere of life.

Did you consider it as a mark of confidence that he intrusted to you a negotiation of the sort you have mentioned?—If it was not a mark of confidence, I should not have pledged myself to lord Clancarty.

Did you never ask of lord Sligo what Seat it was that he had the command of, which you were to offer to a third person?—I think that would be doubting his integrity, because I have not an idea that lord Sligo would place me in so unhand-some a situation, as to let me offer a thing which he would not enable me to perform.

Did lord Sligo directly authorize you to make an offer to lord Clancarty of this Seat in Parliament?—Doubtless; how could I go to offer such a thing without; if he did not, I would not have done it.

Did he or did he not authorize you?—He did.

Do you know at what time, near this transaction, Mrs. Grove came to England from Ireland?—I absolutely cannot take upon me to say; I was in Ireland with my wife and myself, and we dined with her at different times, and in coming to town we wrote to her from Bath, and when I came to town I made inquiry and found she was at the house of Donovan; I believe it was sir James De Bath told me she was there, when he dined with me one day; and I went to pay my respects to her, and we were in the habits of great friendship.

At what time did that conversation with lord Clancarty pass, relative to the bond; was it in the winter or the summer?—I believe it was at our last meeting, near the time that these notes passed.

Was it before or after Christmas?—It was about the time that the change of Ad-

ministration took place after Mr. Pitt's death; I cannot tell to a day or a month, but it was about that time.

What was the occasion of your first conversation with Mrs. Grove on the subject of any appointment to India?—Really I have been so much in the habit of dining with Mrs. Grove, and being with her five or six times a day, being a sort of half-way house between the city and my house, that I cannot exactly tell.

Was Mrs. Grove acquainted with Mr. Ogg?—She was the first that mentioned Mr. Ogg's name to me.

In consequence of what conversation on your part, or application, did she mention to you the name of Mr. Ogg?—I cannot at this moment tell how that came round; but I am of opinion this person of the name of Donovan was in negotiation with Mr. Ogg, or some branch of his family, and by this the name of Davies was mentioned; I refused seeing Donovan at this period; I held him as much in contempt as I now do the other. Mrs. Grove told me he was not the bad man that I thought, and begged me to see him: the name of Ogg came out, and she begged me to accompany her to Mr. Davies's house, and I did accompany her there.

What passed in that conversation?—Not being willing to let Mrs. Grove know every thing that I had in confidence from my friend, I desired Davies to call upon me the next day; he called at my house the next day, or in a day or two, and we had a long conversation about this subject, by which we agreed to have a meeting at Lloyd's Coffee-house; when I went there, and found the deception of this other 500*l.* I told him they were all a set of people that I would not be seen in the company of, and took myself away.

From whom did you receive information of this other 500*l.*?—It came out in this way: Mr. Livie was not prepared to pay the whole sum; the additional 500*l.* was mentioned, and he said he would pay it at a future time. I said, What 500*l.*? I saw Davies put his foot over, to tread on Mr. Livie's foot; and I saw there was something of deception. I said, I will have nothing to do with you, there is something behind dishonourable; and I took myself away.

Had you any further transaction with Davies, respecting this?—I never spoke to him from that time to this.

Did you state to Mrs. Grove, that you had a Writership at your disposal?—I told Mrs. Grove all about it.

Did you tell her of your conversations with lord Clancarty?—Yes, and how the thing went off; she was highly offended; she said, she would write to lord Clancarty; I said, she had better not mention my name, nor write to him. I knew Mrs. Grove was very intimate with his uncle.

Did you ever see Mrs. Grove in company with lord Clancarty?—I do not know that I have; I know that she is very intimate with Mrs. Burgoyne, who married his uncle.

Did you ever see Mrs. Grove in company with lord Sligo?—Yes, I do believe I have; but I cannot downright take upon me to say that I have.

What part of the money to be paid by Mr. Ogg, was Mrs. Grove to have?—She was to have a loan for some time, till her affairs were arranged; she had a large fortune left her by lord Annesley, and she was embarrassed.

Of how much was her loan to consist?—I do not know at this moment.

Are you sure you cannot recollect what part of the money she was to have, either as a present or a loan?—If I were sure, I would without hesitation tell you, but I am not.

What is the reason you refused to communicate to lord Clancarty, the Seat for which he was to be returned?—Because I was not authorized by my friend.

Do you know for what Seat he was to be returned?—I never asked.

Was Mr. Ogg appointed to the Writership?—No, on the contrary, he was disappointed.

Do you know who was appointed to the Writership?—I do not.

Who settled the shares into which the money, if it was received, was to be distributed?—That was not exactly settled; it was agreed so much money should be received, and when we got it was the time to distribute it; I expected no more than five-per-cent.; I believe Davies expected no more; and, without the money in question, I would go any way to serve my friend.

What part of it was lord Siigo to receive?—I do not know; when the money was got, and he had given away his property, if it was his property, it was with his lordship, to do as he liked, and to judge whether any of us were to have any; he was a very worthy man, and I had not a doubt he would do what was proper.

Do you suppose that he employed you in this transaction, from his friendship to you and his desire to benefit you?—It is

not to be supposed he wanted to do me any harm, when he was always desirous to see me in a morning at any time; I looked upon his friendship as doing me a great honour, and that he was willing to do me a service.

Did he first propose to you that you should undertake this negociation, or did you propose it to him?—He proposed it to me, because I had not such a thing in my power.

Did he commission you to apply for a Writership to be sold to a person unknown to him, in consideration of which he was to return a person also unknown to him, to Parliament?—I do not think lord Clancarty was unknown to him.

Did you conceive from any conversation with lord Sligo, that he had any particular desire, from his friendship to lord Clancarty, to return him to Parliament?—From the many conversations I had with lord Sligo, I have not a doubt he would willingly do lord Clancarty a service; but if things were not done so, lord Clancarty might do this in another way; I did not know myself that I was doing wrong.

What benefit was lord Sligo to derive to himself from this transaction?—It was with lord Sligo to give any body any part of the money; I am sure he was so honourable a man he would not do any thing but what was proper; the thing was entirely at his disposal, and his alone.

Do you mean that the whole money was at his disposal?—Yes, except what was given to Davies, his commission must be paid; and if I had had the remainder of the money, I should have brought it to lord Sligo without hesitation.

Was not Mrs. Grove originally to have a part in this sum of money?—I knew her at that time to be embarrassed, and I meant to assist her with a loan, even out of my own pocket, if this thing did not come at all.

Had you any money in your own pocket at that time, to assist Mrs. Grove or any other person?—Yes, I always had money in my possession since my marriage; I married the daughter of Mr. Fenton.

Have you lent any money to Mrs. Grove?—I never lent her any money; the last time I was in Dublin, she asked me to lend her 500!. I told her I was coming home, and that I had no money in Dublin.

Have you had, at any other time in your life, any thing to do with Patronage under the East India Company?—I never in my life went so far as in this thing, and this died away without its being com-

pleted; and I would willingly have nothing more to do with any thing of the kind."

Now, reader, before you proceed further, stop a little, and reflect upon what this man says. You see, he talks of the distribution of the money, and of a *Commission* that one of the agents was to receive, with the greatest possible ease. He talks, too, of the *honour* and of the *integrity* of the Marquis, who was to sell or swap the Seat in the Commons House of Parliament! This is the *constitution*, is it? Is this what we are to spend our last shilling and to shed the last drop of our blood for? And are we "*conspirators*," because we do not approve of members of Parliament being *thus* returned? Yes, Lord Castlereagh is to call us jacobins, and to lament that he has not sharper libel-laws, because we complain, that such men as Reding and Davies and lord Clancarty and himself have a hand in making laws to tax us.—But, let us proceed to the two lords.

#### LORD CLANCARTY'S EVIDENCE.

"In consequence of the examination of Mr. Reding, in which your lordship's name was mentioned frequently, I am desirous in the first place to know when you became acquainted with Mr. Reding?—About the month of October, 1805."

On what occasion did you first become acquainted with that person?—*With respect to obtaining a Seat in Parliament.*

Did you see him frequently upon that occasion?—Three, four, or five times; more than twice certainly.

Did he hold out that he had the power of procuring a Seat in Parliament?—He did; he represented that a friend of his in Parliament, a very respectable man, was desirous of retiring from Parliament, but wished to make that retirement subservient to the object of obtaining a situation for a young man, a relative of his, either a son or a nephew, to the best of my recollection, and stated that if a Writership could be obtained for the party, he would be willing to retire. Having no wish to save any expence upon my part, and having no Writership to dispose of, the negociation at that time closed.

Was this negociation renewed with Mr. Reding, and upon what occasion? It was; having mentioned the circumstance to my friend lord Castlereagh, and expressing great disappointment that the Seat could not be obtained, he told me that he had a Writership undisposed of, which, as far as

he himself was concerned, he should be very happy to give me the recommendation to ; stating, at the same time, the necessity of the most minute enquiry into the character of the party to be recommended ; after various interviews with Mr. Reding, in order to obtain from him the name of the party who was to retire, as well as of the person to be recommended, and not being able to obtain either, the negotiation altogether closed.

Did Mr. Reding, during any part of this negotiation, offer a bond to your Lordship ?—No.

Did he at any time offer money for this appointment ?—When the negotiation had closed as to the Writership, he asked me whether three thousand guineas, *laid on Lady Clancarty's toilette*, would induce me to give him the Writership, which I very indignantly refused ; after which I never saw him in my house once, nor any where except meeting him accidentally at Lord Sligo's.

Did any thing pass between your Lordship and Mr. Reding, at Lord Sligo's ?—Yes ; lady Clancarty, two or three days after I had thus dismissed Mr. Reding, received a letter, signed, I believe, Charlotte Johnson, offering her £3,000, or guineas, for her influence with me to procure a Writership, and appointing a shop in the Strand to meet the party and receive the money ; this letter was of course put into the fire, without any notice being taken of it ; but the sum tallying so exactly with that Mr. Reding had offered, and coming so immediately after Mr. Reding's proposal of the same nature, when I met him at lord Sligo's, I desired him to take care not to allow his friends to write any more impudent letters to lady Clancarty ; and when he was gone out of the room I apologized to lord Sligo for having made use of such language to a person in his house, and informed him of the reasons for my so doing. Mr. Reding, however, denied having any thing to say to the letter.

Did he ever give you to understand at whose disposal this Seat in Parliament was, which he offered you.—No, never ; it was upon that, that the negotiation went off.

Did lord Castlereagh offer you this appointment of a Writership for the purpose of facilitating your being returned to Parliament, if that could be obtained by this means ?—Certainly ; it being always to be understood that the party was of sufficient respectability to be eligible for the situation.

Did you communicate to Mr. Reding that you had a Writership at your disposal, which you were ready to give to his friend if the person recommended was perfectly eligible, provided the Seat in Parliament could be obtained ?—I certainly gave him to understand that I had ; or that the thing might be procured.

Did you ever dispose of any Writership ?—Never in my life.

Do you recollect whether the name of Mrs. Grove was mentioned in any part of this transaction by Reding ?—No, never.

Did you ever hear from Reding the name of the marquis of Sligo, mentioned as connected with this transaction ?—Never.

Or the marquis of Bath ?—Never ; I believe no name of any sort was mentioned to me.

Do you know to whom this Writership, offered to yourself, was afterwards given by lord Castlereagh ?—I have not the least knowledge.

#### LORD CASTLEREAGH'S EVIDENCE.

How did your lordship become acquainted with Mr. Reding ?—I think it was in the latter end of the year 1805, that I received a letter from Mr. Reding, which some days afterwards I sent to lord Clancarty ; I saw Mr. Reding between the receipt of that letter and the communication of it to lord Clancarty, with this exception, I never had any knowledge whatever of, or intercourse with, Mr. Reding.

What was the subject of Mr. Reding's letter to your Lordship ?—I had vacated my Seat on the acceptance of the Seals for the Colonial Department ; the object of Mr. Reding's letter was to say, that he thought he had the means of assisting me in coming into Parliament, if I was not already provided with a Seat.

Did any thing pass in your conversation with Mr. Reding, relating to a Writership ?—Nothing whatever ; I told Mr. Reding I did not want a Seat in Parliament for myself, but that a friend of mine did ; I asked him to name the gentleman who proposed to vacate ; this he declined till the terms were settled, with which having nothing to do, I inclosed his letter to lord Clancarty, and never saw Mr. Reding afterwards, or had any communication with him.

Had you any conversation with lord Clancarty, as connected with this transaction of Mr. Reding's, in which a Writership was offered to lord Clancarty's nomi-

nation?—I think, some time after I inclosed Mr. Reding's letter to lord Clancarty, lord Clancarty told me he had a negotiation with Mr. Reding, *with a view to procure a Seat in Parliament*, which he said had failed; in as much as the proposition he had made to Mr. Reding, which was of a pecuniary nature, had been declined by the person who was supposed to have the influence to procure the Seat in Parliament.

What passed between your Lordship and lord Clancarty in consequence of this?—I should state, as preliminary to answering that question, that nothing in point of fact ever arose out of the communication I had with lord Clancarty, by which the disposal of any Writership was affected, nor did the nomination to any Writership take place in consequence of that communication. With reference to the question itself having been put to me by the Committee, I feel it my duty to give an explicit answer to it; *that I was induced to place a Writership at lord Clancarty's disposal, and that certainly the impression under which I did it, was, that lord Clancarty's coming into Parliament might be thereby facilitated.* I stated, however, to lord Clancarty that I did not feel that I could recommend any person for a Writership in the East India Company's service, who was not individually and in point of connexions a proper object to receive a political favour of such a nature from a member of the government, and such a person in point of character as the Court of Directors were entitled to expect to be placed in their service, in consequence of any nomination they had placed at my disposal, on which point my decision must be reserved till I knew who the party was that solicited the appointment.

Subject to those qualifications, was it your lordship's intention to have placed this nomination at lord Clancarty's disposal, to be given in consideration for his being returned to Parliament?—*I conceived lord Clancarty, subject to those qualifications, entitled to call upon me for the Writership if it could be of use to him, either for THAT PURPOSE or any other that he was interested about, and which had no relation to a pecuniary transaction.* I must observe, however, that my conversation with lord Clancarty arose out of a particular case stated, and, I believe, was never acted upon by him, otherwise than to ascertain whether that case had any existence in point of fact. I certainly did not conceive, in so placing a Writership at lord Clancarty's disposal,

that it could possibly become the subject either of sale for money, or general barter for a Seat in Parliament.

Do you recollect to whom this Writership was given?—I think, some time afterwards, lord Clancarty told me that he had no wish to dispose of the Writership, and that in consequence of that intimation from him, it was disposed of to the young man who was in my contemplation for this appointment, if no communication of the nature described had taken place between lord Clancarty and myself; and that, in point of fact, the name of the individual appointed to that Writership will be found in the list of the disposal of my Patronage; but I cannot specify the name, as there were two or three appointments of mine at that moment not filled up, and as it never proceeded to the length of my doing any act in furtherance of such a purpose, or to my giving any directions to Mr. Meheux, the assistant secretary of the India Board, to carry such an appointment into effect, I cannot state the particular Writership that would have been so used if it had led to any result; but I can state that any Writership I could have so used was, in point of fact, filled up by a friend of my own perfectly unconnected with the transaction, and that his name stands, in the list before the Committee, probably in the appointments of the subsequent year.

Was the name of Mrs. Grove ever mentioned to your lordship in this transaction?—Never; I never heard the name of Mrs. Grove in my life, till it was mentioned to me in the house of commons a few days since, connected with a story which I know to be false, and which induced me to communicate to the chairman of the Committee the story itself, and to put him in possession of all the means which occurred to me, as best calculated to detect the falsehood and to further the inquiries of the Committee upon that subject.

Was the name of Mr. Davies mentioned to your lordship in this transaction?—I think it was on the same night that I had heard the above story in the house of commons that I found a letter on my table, when I returned home, from a man of the name of Davies, stating that he had been summoned to give evidence before this Committee, with respect to a Board of Control Writership, which was supposed to have been offered or actually sold through Mrs. Grove's agency, and stating his general reluctance to be called upon to give any evidence in which my name was con-

cerned. I immediately wrote an answer to Mr. Davies, to say, that he could not do any service more grateful to me than attending the Committee, and giving them every assistance in his power in executing the purposes of their inquiry, and in detecting the falsehood to which his letter referred ; and I think on the following day I communicated Mr. Davies's letter to the chairman of the Committee ; I had no other knowledge of Mr. Davies, nor ever saw him, and never heard of his name except in that letter.

By the means of any other Writership, has your lordship ever endeavoured to facilitate any other person's coming into Parliament ?—Never in my life ; I never had any communication of such a nature ; nor have I ever had any interference, direct or indirect, in the disposal of any Writership, other than those, a list which is now before the Committee, the appointments to which I apprehend will speak for themselves."

Now, then, how stands this Case ?—Reding tells us, that he made to lord Clancarty, who was then one of the members of the Board of Control ; that is to say, one of the persons whom we pay to see that the East India Company act properly : He tells us, that, to this lord he made the proposal of a swap of *a Seat in Parliament* for an East India *Writership*.—Lord Clancarty tells us, that he became acquainted with Reding in consequence of a proposition, respecting a Seat in Parliament ;—that Reding told him of a friend of his (Reding's) who wished to vacate his Seat, but wished to make his retirement subservient to the object of obtaining a situation for a young man.—[Stop, here, reader, and observe the *verbosity* of this lord. Why not say, in one word, that he wished to make a *swap*?]—Well, come, my lord, let us hear it.—That he wished to make his retirement subservient to the object of obtaining a situation for a young man, a son or nephew, and added, that if a Writership could be obtained for the party, the said friend would willingly retire.—Very well, my noble lord. Very well. Now, upon this villainous proposition being made to you, who was a member of the Board of Controul, and who knew that law upon law existed to prevent Seats in Parliament from being obtained through any other means than the free voice of the people ; upon this villainous, this corrupt, this infamous proposition being made to your noble lordship, what did your lord-

ship do ? Did the high blood begin to gallop in your veins, and did you kick the dirty jobber down stairs ; or did you consign his devoted carcass to the foot of a porter ? Neither ! your lordship did neither. But, you tell us, drily, that, having, at that time, no Writership to dispose of, the *negociation*, at that time, closed —Well ! but, reflection told you, that this was not the way for an honest man to become a representative of the people ? Not at all, it seems ; and, you are not ashamed to tell us, that you renewed the *negociation* with Reding ; that, having mentioned the circumstance to your friend, *Lord Castlereagh*, he told you, that he had a Writership undisposed of, to which he would be happy to give you the *recommendation*, but enjoined you to see that the person *recommended* was a proper one. Oh ! yes, yes. It was just so in the case of Mrs. Clarke's and Mr. Donovan's *recommendations*. They were all mightily proper persons, who were promoted through them. All was quite regular too. MR. BURTON, the Welch Judge, found something most delightful in the promotion of Sammy Carter, her footman, though he found a great deal of fault with the poor lady herself. All her appointments were excellent ; and so, I dare say, Mr. Reding's would have been.—But, my lord, my lord ! Pray explain to us, in the country, who are unused to these refined matters, how it came to pass, that your lordship, who, when you and Mr. Reding had first the mutual honour to meet and to *negociate*, had, “no wish to save any ‘expence,’ did, before you had the pleasure of seeing him again, think of mentioning to Lord Castlereagh, that *Mr. Reding wanted a Writership* ?—Well ; but to come to the point ; leaving your lordship to answer this question ; to account for your not half-killing Reding, when he offered to put 3,000*l.* upon your lady's toilette ; and for the mild manner in which you reproved him when you accidentally met him afterwards, at the Marquis of Sligo's : leaving all this without any particular comment, let us now come to the point with your lordship. The question put to you is this : “Did Lord Castlereagh offer “you this appointment of a Writership for “the purpose of facilitating your being re-“turned to parliament, if that could be ob-“tained by this means ?”—Your answer, is, “CERTAINLY.”—You are then asked whether you told this to Mr. Reding ; and you say, that you gave him to understand it.—Very well.—And, now, my Lord of Castlereagh, you, who talk of

Jacobin Conspiracies, and who see such great “difficulties in producing legal conviction in cases of libel;” now, my lord, what is it that you have to say; Why, first, that *you* received; you, even you, a Privy Counsellor and a Minister of State, received a letter from Mr. Reding; from the man who offered to lay a 3,000*l.* bribe upon Lady Clancarty’s toilette, and that you sent this letter to Lord Clancarty; though the object of “the letter was to “say that *Mr. Reding had the means of ass-sisting you in coming into parliament?* You even saw this Mr. Reding, and you did, what? Did not even you kick the jobber out? O, no! You told him, that you did not want a seat, “but that a friend “of yours did.”—You were supplied with the article, and therefore, you sent the parliament-seat pedlar on to the next door.—Well, what next? Did they deal? Did your friend make a purchase, or a swap? Neither. But, whose fault was it? Why Reding’s; for you tell us, that the negotiation failed, “in as much as “the proposition, which was of a pecuniary nature, had been declined by the person, who was supposed to have the influence “to procure the Seat in Parliament,” and not by your friend Lord Clancarty.—Then what did you do? Did your duty as a Privy Counsellor, as a Minister of State, as a Servant of the king, or as a Representative of the people, induce you to put a stop to this villainous, this illegal, this corrupt, this dirty negotiation? No: but, instead of that, “you were induced to “place a Writership at Lord Clancarty’s disposal, and that certainly the impression, under which you did it, was, that “Lord Clancarty’s coming into parliament might THEREBY be facilitated.”

—We want no more. He that wants more than this ought to be a slave all the days of his breath. He ought to be loaded till his back cracks; the lash ought to visit him every hour of the day; the thumb-screw, the picket, the torture, the rack; all, all this and much more he deserves, if this evidence be not sufficient to convince him and to fill him with indignation.—And, are we Conspirators and Jacobins; are we enemies of the “illustrious House of Brunswick;” do we deserve to be sent to Gloucester or Dorchester jail; ought we to be exposed to the hell-of solitary imprisonment, because we express our abhorrence of these things? The constitution says, that “the election of members to serve in parliament shall be free;” but, if Seats can be

bought and sold, or swapped for Writerships, where is this constitution; where is that, to preserve which we are called upon to spend our last shilling and to shed the last drop of our blood?—Well and truly did sir Francis Burdett say, that it was not so much in hard money as in a traffic of offices, that the work of corruption was, now-a-days, carried on. Here we have the system, thanks to Mr. Wardle, laid open before us. It is laid bare. We see it as plain as we do our hands and our nails. Some of us knew, before, of its existence, and we all felt its deadly effects. But, until now we had not the ocular demonstration; there was room for the minions of corruption to cavil and deny. Now there is no room for this at all. The man that shall now dare attempt it, must be regarded as a knave or a fool.—But in “point of fact,” say their lordships, *no swap did take place* with Mr. Reding. So it was with the *Tinman of Plymouth*. He only tendered a bribe. He did not give it. He, too, was capable of the office, and said his intention was to perform all its duties with diligence and probity; but he, though he infringed no statute; though he was guilty of no attempt to purchase or sell or barter Seats in Parliament; and, though he was himself an ignorant man, and in no post of public trust; he, poor Hamlin the Tinman, was sentenced to pay a fine of a hundred pounds to the king and to be imprisoned for three months; and this, he was told, was demanded by “public justice,” and in vindication of the purity of the times in which we live.—Reader, bear this sentence in your mind. Compare the conduct of the Tinman with that of Reding and these lords; and then compare the consequences of their conduct to the parties respectively.—Come forth, you “bold divines;” why do you not come forth, and tell us how these things accord with the principles of the religion you teach us. Not a word will you say. This is *religious*, then, is it, as well as *constitutional*? The persons, who do these things, have all taken that sacrament, and those oaths, you will observe, which the Roman Catholics refuse to take; and for which refusal they are kept out of office. Don’t blame me for thus accusing you. “Those that are not with us are *against us*;” and, again, I tell you, that when *democrats* were to be attacked, the book-shops teemed with your political sermons. I tell you once more, and I tell you this once for all, that you shall be our *friends*, or you shall be consi-

dered as our *enemis*. There is no contemptible troop of your body, who have come out to our view in these disclosures; come forth, then, and disclaim them; prove to us, by your works, that you are not partakers in their principles, or be content, that we lump you all together.

—Show me, you trading Anti-Jacobins; shew me in the whole of the list of the miscreants and of the mean and contemptible wretches that have been exhibited to the world, through the means of these Inquiries; shew me, amongst the whole, one single jacobin; one single man that has ever been accused of *jacobinism* or of *disloyalty*. Not one; and THE PRESS, though there are hundreds and hundreds of persons attached to it, some rich and some needy, and all of them possessing more or less of talent and of means of information; the Press is not disgraced by having one man belonging to it found dabbling, even in the smallest degree, in these base transactions.—Of lawyers, of parsons, of soldiers, of doctors, of merchants, of men in office; of all sorts of people and of almost all professions, there are some or one to be found, except that of the Press. There was one bookseller, whose name was, indeed, mentioned; but, it was as his having advised the drawer of the Military-Club Address to *abandon the project*, and that drawer was stated to be a *parson*.—The Press has none of the filth of the thing resting upon it. Nothing has it had to do in the corruptions; its only crime is, that it is well known to have paved the way for their exposure; but, and let the fact be well noted, every one of those, who have conspired against it, has, from the highest to the lowest, as far as things have yet gone, been, in due order and degree, severely and justly punished, and thus, I confidently hope, the course of justice will proceed, 'till the nation as well as the Press be righted and avenged.

**TRADING ANTI-JACOBINS.**—I have long delayed the execution of justice, in a set and formal manner, upon this race of politicians.—I have often called them *traders*, *regular traders*, and the like; and have occasionally shown how dearly the people of England have paid for the “*loyalty*” of the said traders. I have said, many times, that they found Anti-Jacobinism a thriving trade; and that, therefore, they were unwilling to give it up. I have pointed out the many efforts, which, from time to time, they have made, to make the people believe, that there was still a jacobin conspiracy going on. Many, and, in-

deed, the greater part of the nation, have long been convinced, that there was no such thing as jacobinism existing in the country, and that the cry of jacobinism, set up against every man, who complained of abuses or corruptions, was a mere lure, a mere contrivance, to deceive honest and uninformed men. But, it was not 'till Mr. Wardle came out with his exposures, that the whole nation saw clearly to the bottom of this villainous deception. It was not until his Charges, which, in the hope of being able to *cry him down*, were answered with a charge of jacobin conspiracy, that the whole mass of the people began to see the detestable fraud, which had so long been practised upon them, and of which many men of great understanding had become the dupe.—Now they are completely undeceived. Now they see, that a *Jacobin* means a man, who endeavours to root out corruptions and to prevent public robbery; and that, as the word imports, an *Anti-Jacobin* means exactly the contrary. Still however, it will be useful to expose the traffick of Anti-Jacobinism. Hitherto we have considered it as something of a *sectarian*, or *political*, nature; but, we are now to abstract our minds from all such associations of ideas, and to consider Anti-Jacobinism merely as a *trade*; a trade in the plain and common acceptation of the word; a mere money-making concern; a calling upon which men enter with no other views than those of Lloyd's and the 'Change, and to which apprentices may be bound in the regular course of law, there being gradations in it from the master tradesman downward, through the foreman and journeyman, to the sweeper and sprinkler of the pavement before the shop.—In this case, as in all others, the best way is to proceed with the stating of *facts*; for, a few facts answer a better purpose, they produce a deeper and juster impression, than can be produced by any general description, from however able a pen it may proceed.—I have, at different times, noticed, and shall hereafter notice, several persons, who have followed, and still do follow, this once flourishing trade. But, if I were called upon to name the tradesman, who has obtained the greatest celebrity in his way, and who most deserves that celebrity; the man who is, in this trade, what Mr. Packwood is in that of razor-strops, truth would compel me to say it was MR. JOHN BOWLES. There are others, who have had great vogue, and have not been without their profits,

such as Mr. Green, Mr. Red-head Yorke, and the co-partnership of the Rev. Messrs. Nares and Beloe (the latter of whom was, sometime since, in the *British Museum*, whereby hangs a tale yet to be told;) there are several clergymen, each of whom has traded very thrivingly upon his own bottom, and there are some others who have carried on the trade, with many journeymen under them; there are Mr. Gentz and that pink of knighthood, Sir Francis D'Ivernois, amongst the foreign traders; but, at the head of the whole most assuredly stands Mr. JOHN BOWLES.—This gentleman was, as the phrase is, *bred to the bar*, but, to use the pun of Admiral Paine, the bar being, I suppose, *bad bread* to him, he changed his calling in or about the year 1792. He appears to have begun, about that time, his manufactory of Anti-Jacobinism, with a pamphlet against TOM PAINE, which being quite to the taste of that minister, who lent, without law, £. 40,000 of the public money, without interest, to two of his then majority in parliament, he made our hero a *Commissioner of Bankrupts*, worth, I believe, about 3 or £. 400 a year.—As yet, however, the term Anti-jacobin was not in use. The trade had begun; but there was not a suitable name for it. The traders called themselves friends to their king and country, and the like; but, John Bull loves short appellations; he is everlastingly prone to abbreviate; it was, therefore, necessary to find out an appropriate term whereby to designate the persons engaged in this new and thriving trade; and, to the honour of the Church, be it known, the term Anti-Jacobin was, at last, discovered by a clergyman.—About the year 1796, the trade seemed to be somewhat at a stand, and therefore, the government, as in the case of other useful trades, such as that of printing bank notes, &c. took it, in some sort, under its immediate protection; or rather, it showed an example to be imitated by others. I here allude to the establishment of the "WEEKLY ANTI-JACOBIN" news-paper. This was an era in the history of the trade. Messrs. Canning and Frere (John Hookham) and George Ellis were the principal Directors in this establishment. They were, too, the fabricators of the choice articles, that went from this shop; but, in setting the thing on foot, they were unable to proceed without the experience of Mr. John Bowles, who, from what source the reader may easily judge, found the means of setting all the machines in motion. But, whether the three persons, before men-

tioned, thought that John's weighty matter would be apt to be too heavy for the wire-drawn work in which they excelled, or whether they were afraid that he would, as senior tradesman, and projector of the establishment, aspire to be the head of the firm, they soon jostled him out of the concern, for which, it is said, that John never cordially forgave them. Messrs. Canning & Co. being engaged in other branches of business at the same time, were, however, compelled to have assistance; and, not liking to take an additional partner into the House, they got a respectable journeyman to superintend the business for them, a Mr. WILLIAM GIFFORD, who had written some good poetry and better prose; who was a very sensible, acute, and, I verily believe, a very honest man; who never ought to have been exposed to the necessity of becoming the journeyman of Canning & Co.; and who always appeared to me to be curiously ashamed of the calling.—At the end of 26 Numbers the manufacture stopped, all of a sudden, to the great surprize of every body; but, the fact is, that the raw material was wanting. Messrs. Canning & Co. had expended their stock of epigrams and antitheses, and, in the latter Numbers were reduced to downright punning. Their pride would not suffer them to resort to the stores of their journeyman; and so the thing went out, like the snuff of a candle.—Short, however, as was its duration, it produced a very powerful example. Mr. Wm. Gifford had first a *patent place* given to him; to that was added a *double commissionership of the Lottery*; to that another place in the Household, making, in total amount, about a thousand pounds a year for life. Pretty well, I think, for 26 weeks superintendence on the printing and publishing of the droppings of the brains of Mr. Canning, Mr. George Ellis, and Mr. John Hookham Frere, neither of whom ever knew him previous to that time!—Reader, stop here, a moment, and ask yourself if it be any wonder that the taxes are heavy. Ask yourself if it be any wonder, that the land-owners are little more than stewards and collectors for the governnment. Ask yourself if it be any wonder that family hospitality has ceased, and pauperism has reared its head where plenty, or, at least, comfortable independence, formerly presided.—Are we told by the traders, that these places must have been given to *somebody*, and that, therefore, it makes no difference to us, in point of expence? First, I deny the premises; for, such places should be abolish-

ed as fast, at least, as they become vacant. But, if we admit the premises, the conclusion does not follow ; for, if such places *must* be given to *somebody*, are there not enough disabled officers of the navy or army ; are there not enough superannuated servants of the public ; are there not enough and enough persons, who have done something for the country, and who are either *pensioned*, or *starving* ; are there not enough of these to give such places to ?—But, it is useless for us to swell and foam with indignation. Thus it has been, thus it is, thus it will be, and thus it must be, while seats in parliament are to be obtained in the manner negociated for by Mr. Reding and Lord Clancarty. —Now we come back to the great regular trader, Mr. JOHN BOWLES, who, though he had been jostled out of the firm of Canning & Co., though he was not allowed to take any, or but very little, share in what they sent forth against every man, be his rank what it would, who disapproved of any of the measures of Pitt, he continued to push on a very valuable concern of his own ; and, as the booksellers well remember, to their cost, he absolutely inundated the town with his pamphlets. He used to publish pamphlets upon “The Political and Moral state of Society at ‘the end of such and such a year,’” in all which pamphlets, though containing some very good stuff, as a sort of pass-port to the rest, he failed not to introduce an abundance of sterling Anti-Jacobinism. In 1804, at the time of one of the Middlesex Elections, he made a grand effort to restore the trade to the flourishing state in which it was in 1797 and 1798 ; and, failing in that attempt did not discourage him from another in 1806, at another Middlesex Election, when he and his new associate, Redhead, did actually bring forward that very Mr. MELLISH, who was, the other day, so justly treated by the freeholders of the county, met at Hackney.—“Well,” says the reader, “but, really, this must have been a very honest and zealous man. Say that his loyalty was purchased ; still he had but 3 or 400*l.* a year, and for that he was obliged to perform the drudgery of a Commissioner of Bankrupts. His loyalty must have been unfeigned and proceed from principle ; for this paltry sum could hardly keep soul and body together.”—Now, reader, we come to the point ; now we come to the secrets of the trade, as carried on by this active and enterprizing Anti-Jacobin, whose real

great occupation was totally unknown to that public, upon whom he so frequently intruded his *moral reflections*.—In the year 1795, there was a *Commission* (a commission is a very convenient thing) appointed for the purpose of superintending the management of *Dutch Property* ; that is to say, the cargoes of Dutch ships detained or brought in. These Commissioners were, by an act of parliament, authorized to take such ships and cargoes under their care, to manage, sell, and dispose of the same, according to instructions which they were to receive, from time to time, from the king in couueil. These Commissioners were five in number, and of the five, John Bowles was one. Let us have all their names, in the language of the Commission : “To our *trusty and well-beloved* ‘James Craufurd, John Brickwood, Allen Chatfield, JOHN BOWLES, and Alexander Baxter.’”—It will seem odd to the public, that this Commission, which began to exist *fourteen years ago*, should have still an existence ; but, when that public comes to see the pretty profits which it was, and still is, bringing in, and how much it was the interest of the Commissioners to protract its duration, it will not be at all surprized at that duration. The document which lets us into an authentic account of this Commission, is the Fourth Report of a Committee of the House of Commons, appointed to controul the several branches of the Public Expenditure, which Report, as far as it relates to this matter, will be found inserted in this present number of the Register.—It will be seen, from this Report, that no bargain was made, as to the *compensation*, which these gentry were to receive. They had the handling of property to the gross amount of nearly THREE MILLIONS sterling. They were seated at a rich feast, and having nobody to carve for them, they were, it appears, not such fools as to forbear from *helping themselves*, which, I dare say, was exactly what Pitt intended. They had too much modesty to remind the government, that no terms of compensation had been settled ; they never, in the course of fourteen years, made any application upon the subject ; but, they set to work very early to feathering their nest, by taking into their own pockets *a commission of five per cent.* upon the gross proceeds of their sales, just as if they had been *merchants*, who had got into business *through talents and labour and capital of their own*, instead of being put into business by a stroke of Pitt’s pen.

This would have been pretty well of itself; but, as the Report will show, they used the money besides; that, instead of paying the cash into the Bank of England, and letting it remain there, according to the terms of the Act of Parliament, they kept large balances in their hands, which they employed in various ways, each taking a share of it to his private banker's, and that they, in some cases, *discounted private bills with it*. In short, their total of profits, according to what they *acknowledge to*, would be £133,193, that is £26,639 to each Anti-Jacobin.—There is a trade for you! A trade that requires no stock, other than that of impudence, and no tools but an inkhorn and a goose quill.—The Report will show what are the opinions of the Committee of the House of Commons upon the exorbitancy of these charges, and upon the general conduct of the Anti-Jacobins, by whom they have been made. The Committee prove, that even according to the principles upon which the charge is made, it ought not to be half what the Anti-Jacobins have made it.—The reader will perceive by looking at the Report, which I do beseech him to read, that the charges upon the sales; that is to say, the *portage, cartage, warehouse room, &c.* amounted to £631,239 sterling, and this, he will see, is nearly one third of the amount of the net proceeds! Very pretty traders these! And, mind, they charge the country, a commission of five per cent. upon *these charges too* as well as upon the net proceeds!—It has been proved before the Committee, that these charges of commission would be unusual and unjust, even if we were to admit the Anti-Jacobins to take the footing of *merchants*; but, reader, is that for one moment to be admitted? What capital did they possess? What advances were they ever required to make, as all commission merchants are? What labour had they ever had to perform in order to get into business?—Again, They charge for the expences of their establishment £17,000 exclusive of all the charges upon the sales. What do they mean by this? What did it consist of, but of a house of £200 a year rent, perhaps; coals and candles; a woman to sweep out the place, and a couple of clerks: for, observe, they themselves were *free* in number? How were these things to cost £1,200 a year for 14 years, especially as almost all their business was ended in 1799?—I shall here introduce an article, upon this subject, from the *Times news-paper* of the 18th instant, which

paper, the reader will please to observe, was that in which John Bowles used to puff off his *loyalty*, and the proprietor of which has very laudably thus endeavoured to undeceive his numerous readers. “These Commissioners, it appears, entered upon their office without making any express agreement what they were to be paid; and they continued so to act for twelve years, without ever giving the slightest intimation to government as to what they were taking in the way of remuneration, whilst they were during this time, on their own authority, withdrawing five per cent. from all the gross proceeds of public money that went through their hands. This they have declared to be the usual mercantile commission; whereas it appears on examination that half that sum, viz. two and a half per cent. is the usual mercantile commission, which even they themselves paid to others.—And farther it appears, that by the usual mercantile practices an interest account is kept between merchants selling on commission and their employers; the former paying to the latter the interest of the average balance retained in their hands: whereas these Dutch commissioners retained an immense balance, some part of which they are discovered to have converted to personal gain, even by negotiating private bills of exchange with it; they admit that they never meant to place the whole of the interest actually received, to the national account; and still less that which might have been received from the more active employment of the money. But their intentions will be plain enough from these circumstances: that of the public money employed at interest they made no minute; no proof of such employment appears in their cash book; and when required by the committee, to give an account of their fees and other emoluments, they directly stated that they had “no salary, fees, or emoluments,” but that commission, which they denominated the usual one.—And lastly it has been seen, that pending these transactions, the country was so distressed, that Mr. Pitt, the Finance Minister, not knowing how to raise money for the public service, did actually apply to these very commissioners for assistance, which they, with an augmenting balance of £190,000 in their hands, declined to afford him, sealing their possession of such a sum; and refusing the country’s money to supply the wants of the country. In

"what language are we to address such men?"

"That pity they to England shew'd,  
"That pity shew to them."

"Oh, JOHN BOWLES! JOHN BOWLES!  
"Little did we think when we were unwittingly inserting thy paragraphs against *jacobins and levellers*, how much thy loyalty was warmed by considerations like these: and even when thou saidst that thou wast no admirer of lord St. Vincent, it hardly occurred to us that he who had driven away the miscreants that gnawed the vitals of the State in one department, might reasonably create terrors in those who were sucking the blood of another.  
"Oh, JOHN BOWLES! JOHN BOWLES!"—Now, reader, leaving this pious man to write his *moral and political State of Society* at the beginning of the year 1809; leaving him to his labours in the Society for the Suppression of Vice, of which he is one of the most zealous members; leaving him to put down bull-baits, village fairs, and two-penny hops, of which he is a mortal enemy, as the people of Peckham, Camberwell, and Dulwich can testify; leaving him to his actings as a Surrey and a Kentish and a Middlesex justice of the peace; leaving his godliness to dictate false assertions about the naked woman at Nottingham, and about the late Duke of Bedford's breaking the Sabbath; leaving him to these occupations, let us proceed to notice one little point in the Report and documents, which, otherwise, may escape public attention. In a paper, laid before the committee, it is said, that the Commissioners trust, that the Committee "will not forget, that *two* of their number, have been under the necessity of relinquishing their professions, in order to attend to their duty as commissioners." Now, I take, it for granted, that John is one of these two; and, then, let the reader bear in mind, that John had actually became a *Commissioner of Bankrupts*, before he was a Dutch Commissioner! Would he have done this, if he had had much practice at the *bar*? I will bet him my right hand against his net proceeds, that he never had the pleading of a cause in his life, though he must have been thirty five years old, at least, before he became a Dutch Commissioner. Besides, he has, during the time, if not the whole time, that he has been a Dutch Commissioner, been also a Commissioner of Bankrupts, and, if I am not much in mistake, he is actually a Commissioner of

Bankrupts at this moment! Well, John, if we do not give full credit to thy professions now, the devil is in us.—The Committee do, indeed, say, that they cannot admit of this plea of compensation for loss of profession; but, why did they not ask, whether the said gentry held no other places under the government? I am persuaded they *all* do at this moment.—But, what a scandalous thing it is, that, when any creature, who calls itself a *lawyer*, is taken into government employ, he is not only to receive the pay of the post, but is to receive compensation for the loss, the imaginary loss, of his profession. Just as if he was *pressed* into the service; just as if he was taken and forced to come to the aid of the country. Thus it is, that the *bar* is enslaved; thus it is that no minister is afraid of legal talents; thus it is that the bar is the tool of the government. Men are bred to the law, not for the purpose of being lawyers, but for the purpose of qualifying for a post and a pension under the government. No wonder, that we see, amongst lawyers, what we have recently seen. In short, this is another of the many ways, in which we have been reduced to our present degraded state; from which state we must raise ourselves, or we deserve to perish as a people, and the means of doing which is only to be found in legal, and constitutional, and loyal applications for a Reform in that assembly, where the laws originate; all other remedies having been tried, over and over again, and having been found unavailing.

—John Bowles was amongst the loudest of those, who clamoured against Sir Francis Burdett for his phrase about the "*accursed Red Book*," the leaves of which he wished to tear out. But, John took care not to tell the public, that *his own name* was in that book, in two places, at least. No; it suited John better to say, that Sir Francis wanted to tear out the name of "our good and pious old king;" and, thereupon, to call him a bloody-minded Jacobin. But, now let the reader say, who has done the most injury to the throne; who has brought most discredit upon the government, Sir Francis Burdett or the abusers of Sir Francis Burdett? The Jacobin Baronet, or the Anti-Jacobin friends and associates of the Duke of York and John Bowles?—John has had a longer race than most men like him; his hour is certainly come. During the late busy season, John had quite slipped out of my mind; and this morning, just as I was thinking

U

about beginning an exposure of the affair of the correct Colonel's improvements, at Chelsea, in dropped, from the mail coach, the Case of John and his 5 per-cent. partners, every one of whom is not only a staunch Anti-Jacobin, but belongs also, I am told, to the Society for the Suppression of Vice; Anti-Jacobins, Anti-bull-baiters, Anti-boxers, Anti-revellers, and Anti-dancers, Anti-every thing that is calculated to draw the people together, and to afford them a chance of communicating their ideas; Anti-every thing which does not tend to abject subjection.—Thus, Reader, have you the grand Anti-Jacobin before you. He comes out at a fortunate time, and serves as an excellent elucidation of the doctrine of those, who set up the cry of Jacobinism against Mr. Wardle; thanks to whom, thanks to whom he for ever given for having opened the eyes of this blinded nation to the character and conduct of these the very worst of its foes.

**LORD FOLKESTONE'S MOTION.**—Colonel Gordon, you must have the patience to wait till next week, our immediate attention being demanded by a discussion, in the House of Commons, containing very high matter indeed. In fact, here we shall find the noble Lord endeavouring to go to the heart of the mischief. He and his associates have taken most of the out-works of corruption, owing to the foolish presumption of the enemy full as much as to their own skill and valour; but, his lordship is now laying siege to the body of the place, into which the enemy appears to have drawn all his forces and all his means, as well of offence as defence.

—On the 17th instant, the Order of the day, that is to say, the business of the day, being read, which business was to take into further consideration the Minutes of Evidence respecting the Conduct of the Duke of York, Lord Folkestone moved, “That a Committee be appointed to inquire into the existence of the corrupt disposal of Offices in the state; of the disposal of Commissions in the Army contrary to the Regulations; and also into the practices relating to Levies; and to report the Minutes of their Evidence, from time to time, to the House;” which motion was seconded by SIR O. MOSELEY.—The reasons for establishing an inquest of this sort, and for having such a man as Lord Folkestone at the head of it, are so manifest, that I need not insert the speech with which his lordship introduced his motion. His lordship asked: “is it possible, that the House of Commons, with the know-

ledge they have obtained, during the late Inquiry, can suffer abuses so flagrant to be daily practised, or permit the past to go unpunished?”—This motion was, however, objected to by MR. PERCEVAL, who is the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the same person, who prosecuted Hamlin, the Tinman.—The objection was, that the motion was too general; too loose; that it would give powers of inquiry too extensive; and, that it ought to have been confined to particular specific objects. In short, that a rummage to the bottom, and through every part of the box, was not proper.—But, let us hear the words of Mr. Perceval himself, as given in the *Statesman* news-paper, which appears to me to contain the fullest report of the debate.—“Mr. Perceval said, ‘that he could not allow the present motion to be put, without declaring his opinion, that it was by no means advisable for the House to agree to it. The Noble Lord grounded his motion on the evidence brought before the Committee appointed to inquire into the conduct of the Duke of York, on these two grounds, ‘that by farther inquiry other individuals might be found out who might be brought to censure or punishment; and that such inquiry would prevent the recurrence of similar abuses in time coming.’—The noble Lord seemed to think a general inquiry necessary without any specific grounds of charge being assigned. Now, he was of opinion that such inquiry could not go to an investigation into the conduct of every individual who might have by chance been concerned in the disposal of any offices. There might be a variety of instances in which persons might have erected themselves into a sort of agency concern, misrepresenting themselves to be authorised by this person and the other, who had power to dispose of offices, while with such persons they had no concern—and in this manner might procure money under the pretence of using their interest with the person who had the actual power of disposing of the office in question, while of this proceeding the person having the gift of the office was utterly ignorant. It might also happen, that the person who had the power of disposing of an office might, as in the case of Mr. Thellusson, give it to a near relation or friend in whom he had confidence, but which might be abused. If the Committee were to institute inquiries of this kind, they would be investigating what they

“bad no right to punish.—ANY FARTHER INQUIRY THEREFORE, HE SUBMITTED, WAS NOT DESIRABLE. He asked, was it convenient or politic to set on foot an inquiry into all abuses that might or might not have happened, for the sake of keeping the public mind in a ferment? (*A laugh*) Gentlemen might laugh. He was satisfied that there were, on the other side, Gentlemen who would not agree with him in this opinion. He believed that these Gentlemen, from no improper feeling whatever, were of opinion that nothing was to be apprehended from the keeping alive this spirit among the people. He therefore was not surprised that they should differ from him. But, he had stated what he believed, that there was no reason to believe that there were such abuses to be detected as those which the noble Lord suspected; and he submitted it to the FEELING of the House, if from the expectation of discovering abuses, they would agree to set on foot an inquiry. He was of opinion it would not be expedient or proper to do so, and he hoped the House would consider before they assented to it. The other object of the noble Lord was to prevent any farther abuses. The House had a note of this already before them—and farther inquiry might only produce further evidence to the same effect, without shewing any new or more extended system of abuse. On this subject, however, there was a Bill before the House, introduced the day before the recess. He hoped it would be found adequate to every object which might seem to be required. It was not the punishment of past offences, which we should so ardently seek, as remedies and preventatives of such abuses. At all events, it was in the power of the House, and of the noble Lord himself, to consider how far it should be extended. He was, therefore, on the whole, of opinion, that the Inquiry proposed would neither be beneficial nor politic. No particular statement of delinquency had been brought forward, and to a general statement the House could not listen, especially after the Parliamentary Inquiry which had lately taken place.”—

—I shall leave the reader to make his own remarks upon the words *chance* and *happen*, as applied to the purchase and sale of Offices, and of low agents misrepresenting themselves as acting for men in high station; and, this I may safely do, after

having laid before him, the case of my lords of *Clancarty* and *Castlereagh* and Mr. Reding! —As to the argument, that to adopt the motion, would tend to keep alive the ferment in the public mind; they do, then, perceive, that there is such a ferment? They are right; it is a ferment of the mind; it proceeds from the conviction of the public mind; and, as LORD ARCHIBALD HAMILTON said, in answer to Mr. Perceval, “the ferment will certainly be increased, and not diminished, if you attempt to stifle further inquiry. That ferment will, by such attempt, most certainly be still further inflamed. If corruption does exist, can the Chancellor of the Exchequer think that no danger is to be apprehended to this country? Does he think that, if such ferment really exists, it would not be more wise to detect, expose, and punish those abuses which are so strongly suspected to exist? As to the alarming extent of the powers of this Committee—they are, it is true, extensive and general, but they may be revoked at the pleasure of this House. —With respect to the dangers to be apprehended from the fermentation in the minds of the people—those dangers, I will venture to assert, are infinitely less to be dreaded than what must ensue from the people discovering our unwillingness to prosecute inquiry into corruption and abuses.—The only way to satisfy the people, and reconcile them to the endurance of the enormous burdns they sustain, is to shew them that we are sincere in our prosecution of those inquiries that will lead to a general reformation of abuses.”—LORD FOLKESTONE answered all the other objections of Mr. Perceval, in a most able and satisfactory manner, during which he observed, that, as Mr. Perceval seemed to think, that no further abuses, of any sort, did exist, he, of course, ought to be the first for a general inquiry, in order to allay that ferment of which he complained. —LORD HENRY PETTY (*the late Chancellor of the Exchequer*, observe: observe that well) joined Mr. Perceval in objecting to the motion, as being too general and sweeping.—MR. WHITBREAD supported the motion of lord Folkestone. He said, “The Chancellor of the Exchequer has acknowledged, that, if inquiry should be instituted, abuses might possibly be traced. This fact, I take it, he has admitted—I shall, however, at any rate, myself assume it. Whatever may be the sentiments in this House, there can be no doubt, that out of it there is an universal feeling of the

“PEOPLE, that various mal-practices would be brought to light by the institution of a *general Inquiry*, such as that which has been moved for by the Noble Lord. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer has argued, that even admitting abuses to be discovered, he should think the appointment of a Committee useless. —‘It is not,’ says he, ‘the punishment of past grievances which we should so ardently seek, as remedies and preventives of a repetition of such abuses.’ Against this, he tells us, it is the very object and foundation of his Bill to provide.—But, much as we know, I must be allowed to question the possibility of his framing any Bill on this subject, which shall be effectual in its provisions, unless we shall first be informed of much more than has hitherto come to our knowledge. And here I conceive the argument which was made use of by the Noble Lord, to be unanswerable. How can you tell, says he, in what manner to frame a Bill to prevent the repetition of abuses, the nature and full extent of which are yet undiscovered? The Chancellor of the Exchequer has told us that before the Investigation which has occupied so much of our time and attention, he was informed of certain *nuisances* in the city. He had heard of the office of Messrs. Pollman and Keylock, who were able to dispose of an extensive patronage, for the most corrupt of all things, money, the grand source and medium of all corruption. Now when the existence of that office was first mentioned in this House, it was received with universal levity, it was laughed at on all sides of the House. But the right hon. gentleman on that occasion, so far from betraying the least consciousness of the existence of any such office, did not even countenance the possibility that the representation which was then made could have the slightest foundation; and he laughed, with the rest, at a statement which was so generally received as improbable. That these gents, Messrs. Pollman and Keylock, had carried on this sale of patronage for years, was very well known—and no attempt was made to put a stop to practices so nefarious—no inquiry was ever instituted—till at length —when the investigation took place, it suggested itself to the right hon. gentleman to put a stop to that species of traffic, by the introduction of his promised Bill. Now will any gentleman pretend to say, that these negotiators of patronage may

“not, somewhere or other, have connections either in the army, or the navy, or in the civil departments of the State; for their negotiations it seems were almost universal, which it is highly desirable for this House to know.—When it is considered what facts have come to light with respect to *East India Patronage*, when we reflect on the names that have come out on the inquiry into that subject—can the right honourable gentleman affect surprize that the public mind should be in a state of ferment?”—Mr. TIERNEY, formerly a member of the “Society of Friends of the People,” next spoke, and he opposed the motion of Lord Folkestone. He said, that the motion went to arraign the whole of the government of the country, through all its departments; whereupon, the reporter says there was a loud cry of “hear! hear!” from the ministerial benches. He declared, that he had no wish to screen delinquency, and should have no objection to an inquiry into *specific cases*. “He differed,” he said, “from the gentlemen opposite in many important political subjects, but neither with respect to them, nor with respect to any man, could he agree to this vague sort of motion. HE HIMSELF HAD BEEN IN OFFICE; he knew the responsibility attached to the situation, and was ready to meet any accusation if fairly stated. But this motion extended back—how far nobody knew—and was calculated to put all those, who, for a great number of years back, had been employed in public situations, upon their trial—many of whom were precluded, in the course of nature, from giving those explanations that might be necessary to defend themselves against charges, or to prevent suspicion.”—MR. HUTCHINSON, MR. T. FOLEY, and MR. PARNELL, gave their decided support to the motion. MR. CHARLES W. WYNN opposed the motion, and said, that “he had heard, that there might be cases brought forward, which had taken place in Ireland, previous to the Union; cases that might affect Lord Cornwallis and Mr. Pitt, who were in their graves.”—Let us stop here, to make a remark, or two, upon this objection.—Is it not something new, reader, to hear, that delinquencies should not be exposed, because some of the parties are dead? What should we say of the man who objected to a trial for robbery, upon the ground that some of his associates had died previous to the trial? Besides, what harm can any inquiry do to Lord Cornwallis or Pitt?

They are safe under ground, pressed hard down by big heaps of stones, that we have paid for to be placed over them in the shape of *monuments of honour*, voted by this very House of Commons; and shall we be refused a general inquiry into abuses, lest something should *come out* about these men, who have cost us such immense sums, dead as well as living? "What good" can it do? Why, very great good indeed; for, it will enable us to form a correct judgment of the character and the deeds of these men, who enjoyed so much power, and for opposing whose measures and attacking whose characters and conduct so many of the people of this kingdom were so severely punished. There are, moreover, enough and enough living, and these, too, men in great power, who were *actors with them*; who participated in all their public conduct; and, because the former are dead, are the latter to escape the effects of inquiry? Inquiry may redound to their *honour*; but, why object to it then?

—There is no occasion to say any thing more about it. The thing is too plain to be misunderstood by any but downright ideots.

—SIR JOHN ANSTRUTHER, the *late Chief Justice in India*, opposed Lord Folkestone's motion, as did also MR. GEORGE PONSONBY, a part of whose speech, as given in the Statesman news-paper, is too interesting to us not to be inserted here. After stating his objections, upon the ground of the general and loose tendency of the motion, he said: "I find it impossible, on the occasion of so extraordinary a proposition, to content myself with a silent vote, and more especially when I see a disposition in some persons, *not in the House*, to charge every public man in the kingdom with corruption. This is a charge of a most serious nature; and particularly when it is considered how readily and with what avidity every thing that is charged against this House is received out of doors. The people are even industriously told in some places that there is no distinction whatever in this House, that we are all knaves and rogues alike—(Hear! hear! hear!)—that it does not signify in what hands the government is placed; for, provided they are *Parliamentary*, the country can expect nothing but corruption. (Hear! hear! hear!) These, Sir, are most foul, impudent, barefaced, and infamous calumnies; for, I will venture to maintain, that there are in this House, men as honest, as upright, as uncorrupt, and possessing as great integrity as those who make these gross and unfounded charges. And, be he who he

"may, I do assert and maintain, that he is "not an honest public man than I am, nor "do I see the smallest reason why I, or "any other member of this House, should "hesitate for one moment to repel this *unmerited* and general stigma. My conduct has already proved, in numerous instances, that in all matters of public economy and reformation of abuses, I am disposed to go as far in the protection of the people against extravagance and abuse as any man in this country—and I am still disposed to persevere in that conduct, which I conceive to be only a faithful discharge of my duty to the public. But to the motion now before the House I cannot agree."—No; Mr. Ponsonby; no, we do not, indeed we do not say, that you are "all knaves and rogues alike." There is not a man in the whole nation, who, as far as I have observed, has ever said any such thing. Indeed, Sir, you must have been misinformed; and, I really wonder how any one should have induced you to believe any such thing, when the people, in all parts of the kingdom, are passing Resolutions, thanking 125 of the members of the House of Commons for their fidelity to their trust.

—No, Sir, indeed we do not say, or think (God forbid we should!) that all members of parliament are alike; but, I will tell you what we do say, what all of us, except those who share in the corruptions, say, and believe, and shall continue to say and to believe; that to us-ward, both PARTIES are as much alike as two peas, or two drops of water; that the promises and pledges, which the late ministry and their adherents, made to us, while they were out of place, they not only forgot the moment they were in place, but laughed us to scorn for expecting that they would fulfil them; that they, who had gained the support of the people by deprecating a waste of the public money, the making of sacrifices for the king's foreign possessions, an employment of foreign troops in the heart of this kingdom, the heavy weight of taxation, and the predominating influence of the crown; that these very men, of whom you were one, did, during the very first session of parliament after their elevation to power, bring in a bill, which bill was passed into a Law, to enable Lord Grenville to hold the Office of Auditor of the Exchequer, a sinecure of 4,000*l.* a year, along with the place of the First Lord of the Treasury, at 6,000*l.* a year; that they settled large pensions upon Mrs. Fox! and her daugh-

ters; that they declared, that they would advise the king *never to make a peace*, of which the restoration of Hanover to him should not be a condition; that they augmented the then large numbers of German and other foreign troops; that they, who had so solemnly protested against the Income Tax, made its weight upon us nearly double what Pitt had left it; that they screwed up the assessed taxes to the highest degree, and that they attempted to send an exciseman into the house of every creature in the kingdom who had the means of brewing a cask of ale to make merry at the christening of a child; and, that they closed their career by *withdrawing from parliament*, a Bill which they themselves had brought in under a solemn declaration of its necessity to the tranquillity and safety of the kingdom, and which they withdrew for the reason, openly avowed, that the said bill was not approved of by the king.—Now, Sir, these facts are undeniable. They admit of no palliation. And, with these facts before us, can we be blamed if we despise those, who would still persuade us to have confidence in party?—Sir, in 1804, when there was a sort of coalition intrigue going on for the purpose of jostling the Addingtons out, I sat up part of a night (a thing which I have not done ten times in my life) to write a Letter to warn those with whom you have since been in power, of *their danger*, and of the *danger to the state*, which would arise from any *unprincipled compromise*. In that letter, which was shown to Mr. Fox, Mr. Francis, and others, I pointed out the consequences of a failure; on the part of that party, to fulfil the public expectations. I remember saying: if you go on, or attempt to go on, in *the old Pitt track*, George Rose and Huskisson will beat you hollow. I remember those very words, or words nearly the same. And, was not that the case? Did they not beat you hollow, sir? Did they not laugh at you? Then, I said, that, if such a thing was attempted, it would disgust the people, who would lose all confidence in both parties, and who would very soon see the necessity of flying for protection to other men; very likely to Sir Francis Burdett, and to many men not yet known in the political world. I appeal to Mr. Francis, who told me that he had read the letter, whether it did not contain almost these very words.—I mention this to shew, that I have not been capricious in my opinions. I, in that letter, urged the absolute necessity of a *change of system*. How anxiously I did la-

bour to make converts to my doctrine! but, alas! I laboured in vain. Well; the consequences are now come and coming thick and fast. A sincere and radical reform then would have prevented what has taken place now; and, a sincere and radical reform now would prevent what, without that reform, will take place at no distant day, as sure as this is ink, wherein I am placing my opinions upon this paper.—Now, Sir, as to your own character and conduct, of which, if the reporter be correct, you thought proper to speak, I have never heard, or said, either harm or good of you; and, in fact, all that I know, relating to you, is, that you were for about fifteen or sixteen months, Lord Chancellor of Ireland, since which time you have received, out of the taxes, and are to continue to receive for that service, a pension of *four thousand pounds sterling a year*.—Frankly I tell you, that I am discontented at this; that it is one amongst the many many charges, which, I think, we ought not, at any time, and especially in times like these, to be obliged to bear; that, seeing that the late ministry did, in their going out, as well as in their coming in and during their abidance, in power, act, towards the people, just as the present ministers do, I like one set of ministers just as well as the other; and that, unless a *change of system* were to take place with a change of men, I even dread a change of men, because, at every change, under the present system, new and heavy burdens in consequence of such change, are invariably laid upon the people. —Mr. CANNING's speech and the account of the division must be reserved for my next. That speech was in the strain of MR. TIERNEY's; but, it merits particular notice.—There are also some observations yet to be made upon that part of Mr. Perceval's speech which contains the very novel doctrine, that, in order to prevent *future crimes past crimes are not to be punished*.—In the mean while, I cannot refrain from inserting, below, an admirable article from the TIMES news-paper of the 19th instant, upon the subject of this debate.

*Botley, 20th April, 1809.*

N. B. All the RÉSOLUTIONS, &c. which have been obligingly sent me, from different places, shall be regularly inserted as fast as I can find room.

FROM THE TIMES, 19th APRIL, 1809.

"The decision upon Lord FOLKESTONE's motion is one of the most politic, funda-

mentally (though for different reasons than those which were alledged), that could possibly have taken place. A general inquiry, rigorously conducted, into the disposal of offices, might perhaps have led to several unpleasant discoveries, which it was therefore by all means useful to avoid; and both parties seemed to be very strongly impressed with this idea. We heard no more of courting inquiry—of challenging publicity; one sacrifice has been unluckily made to this bragging humour, and that will serve as a warning to those who remain—but the principle upon which the proposed inquiry was ostensibly smothered, seems to be a very singular one, and to most apprehensions might with greater reason have been urged in favour of the prosecution of it. “General suspicions of the integrity of men in power are every where prevalent; and therefore we will not institute a general but a specific inquiry.” Now this does appear to us to be much the same kind of reasoning as if a ship-captain, having great reason to suspect the universal sea-worthiness of his vessel, should still chuse to examine only this cable or that anchor. The fact is, and it is stated by both parties, that suspicions are indeed, general enough: Mr. CANNING says, that public men are represented “as having nothing in view but the emolument of office,” and that there is a “persuasion alive in the public mind, “that rottenness and corruption exists in “every part of the state.” But if such is the allowed persuasion, how is it to be eradicated? By prohibiting inquiry into the truth of it? No! this is only increasing the suspicion, and rendering improvement hopeless. That the emoluments of office have *some* influence over the minds of those who accept them, is clear; because we see them, upon their very acceptance, bargaining for lucrative resignations, for accessory sinecures, for pensions for their mothers, sisters, sons, and nephews; and to say that this love of the public money is so nicely circumscribed that it will only tempt men to do dirty actions, but can in no case prevail on them to commit dishonest ones, seems to be drawing a very nice line of distinction.—Besides, who are they that tell us that the public suspicions are altogether unfounded? Why, the very men who assured us that there were no abuses in the Commander-in-Chief’s office: and look how much this illustrious person has been injured by them. In his ease, say they, “suspicions exist,

“and therefore examine into the grounds of them: you cannot make the Inquiry ‘too public.’” But now observe how their tone is altered, and how much wiser they are become by experience: “Suspicions,” say they again, “exist, and therefore ‘don’t enquire into them at all; it only ‘keeps alive the public ferment.’” Yet surely if an experiment was to have been made, a less exalted personage might have been chosen as the subject of it; and such we believe is the loyalty of this kingdom, that most people will regret that his wings have been singed, on finding that those who thrust him into the flame are resolved not to come within smell of the smoke. But these are among the misfortunes that attend men of no party. It was a grievous damage that his ROYAL HIGHNESS suffered by that detested pamphlet published in the course of last summer. And while we are speaking of the dangers which thus attend men of no party, we shall venture to add further, that if Colonel WARDLE, who possesses that character, had six months ago confessed himself to have offered East India patronage for a seat in Parliament, such would have been the virtuous indignation of that Assembly, that he would never have sat long enough therein to have preferred his charges: nay, if under an imputation of this kind he had ventured to hint the slightest suspicion against any man in office, there would have been such a cry raised against him, as would have stunned us all; so that he had better look to himself in future.

“If they can catch him once upon the lip,  
“They will feed fat the ancient grudge they bear  
“him.”

Something, too, has been said of the malignity with which public men are assailed; but do public men never assail others with malignity? Who first applied the odious term of infamy to an hypothetical failure in proving an honest accusation? A public man. Who branded his fellow-subjects with the accursed appellation of Jacobins? A public man. Who cheered *him* with applauses, that might be heard from Westminster to Guildhall? Public men. And what has been the consequence? that the expressions “un-“worthy of confidence,” “corrupt,” “venal,” have been re-echoed upon public men from Guildhall to Westminster. Who they are that have suffered most by this foolish warfare, they too well feel that first complain.—That there is a considerable ferment in the public mind, it is im-

possible to deny; and that it will be kept alive by inquiry, we fully concede to those who assert it; for it is the discovery of corruption, and not of purity, that has produced the ferment: and the same cause which first provoked is most likely to encrease it. But are not the ebullitions of anger preferable to the gloom of despair? From a prosecuted inquiry, what can ensue but the detection of offenders? From a stifled one, nothing but the indiscriminate confusion of the innocent and guilty. It has been said, that such a Committee as that which was moved for is unprecedented. Are not the grounds of suspicion unprecedented? Who would have ever thought of such discoveries as have been recently brought to light? When was it ever declared by a resolution of the Body Corporate of London, that a variety of "abuses discovered, formed only a part of a wicked and corrupt system long acted upon;" "that the management of public affairs was in the hands of the greatest pensioners and reversionists in the kingdom;" "that a pernicious influence existed, corrupting and undermining the free principles of the British Constitution." Let any man look at the important place which the proceedings of that Body occupy in the pages of even our most compendious histories, and then let him say whether such a resolution ought to be passed by unheeded.

---

#### REPORT RELATING TO THE DUTCH COMMISSIONERS.

Your Committee, having derived from the Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings of the Committees on Public Expenditure of the preceding Sessions referred to them by the House, some material information respecting the establishment and the transactions of the Commissioners for the Sale, Management, and Disposal of Dutch Property, captured or detained on the occasion of the commencement of hostilities with Holland, in consequence of its invasion by the French, have pursued the investigation of that subject, and proceed to report upon it.—The Commissioners, who were five in number, were appointed in 1795 under the authority of the 21st clause of the 35th Geo. 3. c. 80; and their Commission, after reciting in the words of the Act, that "the Cargoes of Dutch Ships, detained or brought in, might perish or be greatly injured if some provision was not made respecting the same, authorizes the Commissioners to take such Ships and

Cargoes under their care, and to manage, sell, and dispose of the same according to such Instructions as they should from time to time receive from the King in Council."—The Lords of the Privy Council in their Instructions dated 13 June 1795, direct the Commissioners generally as to the conduct of their transactions, and require them to keep minutes of all their proceedings, and to "keep accounts in such form as the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury shall direct or approve." No instructions appear to have proceeded from the Board of Treasury, and the Commissioners represent themselves to have undertaken their office, without having come to any understanding with any branch of the government respecting the manner of deriving their Compensation for their Services, or the amount of it.—They state, that they were charged with the investigation of numerous claims to British and neutral property found in the detained and captured vessels, and, in many cases acted in a judicial character in this respect; that they received a separate and special commission to take the management of sundry Dutch vessels brought into Ireland; that they had to make arrangements with the East India Company respecting cargoes directed to be sold by the Company at their own sales; that they had to adjust many complicated accounts with their agents at the outports, and to settle the wages of the officers and crews both of the vessels of which the cargoes were sold by the East India Company, and of those which were intrusted altogether to their own management, and that they found the duties of their office to be for some time extremely difficult and laborious. They observe however, that their sales ceased, and their transactions were nearly brought to a close in July 1799, but that the final adjustment of them had been protracted partly by "small sales of remnants not completed till Nov. 1801," partly by some "property claimed in the Court of Admiralty not adjudged till July 1803," partly by "unsettled accounts with the executor of the late King's Proctor, of which the balance was not paid till Jan. last," but chiefly by an important lawsuit commenced in 1797, which brought into question property to the amount of about 180,000*l.* The suit has within these few months terminated in their favour, and the Commissioners now expect that in the course of the ensuing summer they shall close their transactions, and deliver in

their accounts to government.—It appears by a paper dated 29th April 1808, that the gross amount of the produce of the ships and of the ships and cargoes sold (of which cargoes your committee perceive that much the larger part was sold by the East India Company) was

£1,937,064

The Charges were £631,239

Commission charged 88,164

Restitutions to Claim-

ants - - 69,988

Grant to Captors - 117,746

— 907,137

Leaving a net amount of - 1,029,927

From which was further to be deducted on account of loss on ships in debt ('that is, on ships the charges on which exceeded the proceeds) - - - 52,657

Leaving at that time the estimated net sum of - 977,269

—The chief part of the balance now in hand is invested in government or other securities, which run at interest. The sum of 900,000*l.* has been paid at sundry periods to government, and having been carried to the account of the Consolidated Fund, has been applied to the purposes prescribed by parliament.

Your Committee now proceed to offer some Observations on a variety of points to which their attention has been called, referring to the Appendix for a more detailed account of some of the circumstances which they shall notice.—It has been already mentioned, that no agreement in respect to the mode or amount of remuneration was made at the time when the Commissioners were appointed. The difficulty of ascertaining beforehand the degree of trouble to be incurred, and the nature of the duties to be performed, may form, in some cases, a sufficient motive for suspending the determination of both the amount and manner of an allowance. But no circumstances have appeared which furnish a justification of the delay of no less than 14 years, which in this instance has taken place. It belonged to the government, after the lapse of a moderate period, to take up the consideration of the remuneration due to the Commissioners, with a view to its being submitted to parliament; and when the subject had manifestly escaped attention, the Commissioners ought to have given notice of the omission. But they have to this day held no communication with any branch of the

government on this question. Under these circumstances they had, in the judgment of your Committee, no right to appropriate any sums to themselves as compensation; indeed the terms of their Commission, already quoted, direct them to dispose of the Dutch Property intrusted to them only “according to such Instructions as they should receive from the King in Council,” and the Instructions accordingly given, since they merely authorize allowances to crews in payment of wages, do not appear to your Committee in any degree to sanction such application of their funds. The 26th clause of 35 Geo. 3, authorizes the payment of “the Expences of the Sales out of the Proceeds,” but the term “Expences” cannot, in the judgment of your Committee, be construed to include the payment of remuneration to the Commissioners, since neither the mode nor the amount of it had been sanctioned by the government.—It appears, however, that the Commissioners, at a very early period, proceeded both to determine in the first instance for themselves the rate of compensation due, and also actually to apply it to their own use, intending to make mention of this point only on the final settlement of their affairs, though they have from time to time had to communicate with the secretary of the Treasury on other matters, and have transmitted to the Lords of the Privy Council some general statements. The Compensation which they have taken has been a commission of 5 per cent. on the gross produce of the Sales, a subject on which your Committee will offer some further Remarks toward the conclusion of this Report. It has been charged on the principle of a mercantile transaction; but it is here observable, that they have deviated from the custom of merchants, by taking large sums for commission before they had either received or paid over the whole net proceeds of the cargoes, on the gross produce of which the commission was charged, and also before they had rendered up their accounts.—Your committee deem it necessary to animadvert on the length of time which has been suffered to elapse without rendering any regular accounts, and without their being called for by the government.—The chief object of examination in such cases is the detection and rectification of errors, and the recovery of sums improperly withheld from the public; but when any considerable period has passed, the elucidation of accounts is rendered difficult, as your Committee

have experienced in the course of the present investigation, and the recovery of money becomes a measure of harshness. The Commissioner, on whom the Financial Department is said to have devolved, is lately dead: and the want of recollection observable in many parts of the annexed Evidence, is a further exemplification of the inconvenience resulting from the long delay which has taken place.—Your Committee called for a copy of such Statements of the transactions of the Commissioners as had from time to time been delivered by them to the Board of Treasury. The chief paper furnished in return is dated 20th July 1796, being the copy of a Report presented to the Privy Council, which was evidently furnished rather with a view of shewing the sum then deemed likely to accrue from the Sale of Dutch Property, than of submitting the transactions of the Commissioners to examination. It is observable that although in this Report, which is in a great measure an estimate, the total amount of the charges incurred is given, and several particulars composing them are specified, no mention of Commission is made, though it was undoubtedly an item at that time sufficiently large to have been included in the enumeration; for under this head, the sum of 25,000*l.* had been then divided. This omission might lead to a supposition that no commission had been taken.—In the case of successive sales of a similar kind made by merchants acting as factors, it is the custom to make up separate accounts—sales of the several cargoes, until the delivery of which the charge of commission is delayed, and also to render an annual account current, detailing all the receipts and payments of the year. If the transactions of the Commissioners are to be considered as of a mercantile nature, the public ought not to be without the benefit of those checks upon the conduct of their agents which have been generally established among Merchants.—The act authorizing the appointment of the Commissioners, contains a clause “requiring” that they shall “cause the proceeds of their “Sales,” after “payment of the duties and “the expences,” to be paid “into the “Bank of England, there to remain sub-“ject to such orders as his Majesty, with “the advice of his Privy Council, may “from time to time think fit to give there-“upon,” or as the Court of Admiralty may think fit to give in the case of sales made under the authority of that court. Your Committee expected that the cash of the

commissioners would, in pursuance of this clause, have been kept solely at the Bank, but they find that it was during the first year lodged only with a private banker, and that five private bankers have been occasionally employed, each of the commissioners having recommended that a temporary account should be opened with the banker with whom he was individually connected. The clause does not appear to have escaped the attention of the Commissioners; but it is stated in the evidence, that they understood it to apply, not to all the proceeds of their sales as they arose, but to the surplus of the proceeds above the sums expected by them to be wanted for charges and current payments. They have retained a large balance of cash for these purposes, and they represent that they were obliged to do this, because otherwise an order of his Majesty in council for a supply of cash, would from time to time have been necessary, the money paid into the Bank under the direction of the Act being no longer subject to the call of the Commissioners. They further state, that being authorized by the 23d clause of the 35 Geo. 3, c. 80. to restore all goods which should be proved to belong to neutrals, and having sold most of such goods before the decision of the claims; they deemed it necessary to retain cash sufficient for this purpose.—Your Committee nevertheless cannot approve of the construction which the Commissioners have given to the law. Their payments into the Bank appear to have been large payments made with a view to their immediate transfer from thence into the Exchequer; but the terms used in the Act are, that the proceeds, after payment of the duty and expences of sale, were to be paid into the Bank, “and remain there;” an expression which implies, that the cash was not merely to pass through the Bank in its way to the Exchequer, but was to be lodged in the Bank as a place of safe custody, in order to await the direction of the Privy Council. The legislature, however, seems not to have anticipated the circumstance of certain sums being necessary to be withdrawn from the amount of the proceeds in hand, with a view both to the payment of charges and to the restitutions of property due to neutrals; and, by not providing very specifically or conveniently for these objects, it has afforded some countenance to that interpretation of the law which has taken place.—Your Committee think, that the difficulty which opposed the adoption of a

strict construction of the Act, has been much overstated by the Commissioners. At the commencement of their transactions, having no money in hand for current payments, they obtained an Order of Council, directing £25,000 to be advanced to them in order to supply their immediate occasions, which sum was to be replaced by the subsequent proceeds of sales. They might afterwards have obtained successive Orders of Council for similar purposes, as well as for the satisfaction of claimants, without any great inconvenience; and in this case the lords of the Privy Council would have had the opportunity of exercising their judgment as to the amount of the money proper to be placed at the disposal of the Commissioners. A less objectionable mode of proceeding, though not conformable to the Act, would have been to keep two accounts with the Bank; the one, an account of money paid in under the Act, and consequently subject only to the Orders of the King in Council; the other a separate account, subject to the controul of the Commissioners. This expedient was resorted to after the first twelve months, but there was still no relinquishment of the practice of keeping a large balance with private bankers. On the supposition of any uncertainty as to the construction of the Act, the subject ought to have been distinctly submitted to the lords of the Privy Council in pursuance of their instructions, which had directed an application to themselves "in all cases of doubt or difficulty."—Your Committee are further of opinion, that if the Act had been silent on this topic, the Commissioners ought to have lodged their cash in the Bank of England, and with a view to future cases they think that it may be useful to suggest the following general Reasons:—First, The public have an interest in thus preferring the Bank, which is nearly similar to that which the Commissioners may individually be supposed to have had in favouring their respective bankers. Indeed, since the Report on the Bank of England, made by the former Committee on Public Expenditure, in which the average amount of the government balances in the Bank was stated, that Corporation has consented to make some compensation for benefit of this kind, by affording to the public the loan of a considerable sum without interest. A general intention of employing the Bank of England as the banker of the public, was then professed; and there can be no doubt that every preference shewn to the

Bank ought now to be considered as contributing to the liberal fulfilment of the general conditions of that arrangement, and even though not repaid by a specific compensation, as producing some corresponding advantages.—The more safe custody of the public money entrusted to the Commissioners, is another motive for lodging it in the Bank. Your Committee conceive, that in the case of any loss arising out of the confidence which the Commissioners have placed in private banks (an event, in the present high state of credit, admitted to be extremely improbable) the Commissioners would have been personally responsible. There is a third reason for this preference of the Bank of England, which is not less important. The Bank makes no allowance of interest, and shews no species of favour to the individual who places in it a considerable balance of cash. The public accountants, who keep cash in the Bank, are therefore under no temptation to render their balances unnecessarily large, and are likely not to fail in the punctuality of their payments into the Exchequer.—Your Committee have next to notice the too great magnitude of the balances of cash which appear in the cash-book of the Commissioners, especially during a large part of the two first years, a subject not unconnected with the preceding observations.—The paper in the Appendix shews the balance to have been, at the end of Oct. 1795, about 100,000*l.* and to have gradually risen by the end of April 1796, to above 200,000*l.* between which period and the end of May 1797 it fell to about 160,000*l.* It fluctuated between about 80 and 120,000 during the next four years, and between 50 and 70,000 during almost the whole succeeding period.—Your committee have learnt by their inspection of the minute-book of the commissioners, that on the 25th Feb. 1796, information was asked on the part of Mr. Pitt, whether any and what sum then in hand arising from the disposal of Dutch property, could be paid into the exchequer for the service of the current year; and that the Commissioners replied, that no payment of consequence into the Bank according to the act of parliament could be made, unless the Treasury should first move the lords of the Privy Council to direct the India Company to pay a sum (amounting to about 118,000*l.*) then due from the Company to the Commissioners.—At the time of this application, the balance in hand, the amount of which appears not to have been stated to the Treasury,

was about 190,000*l.* and it was never so low as 150,000*l.* in the course of the next 15 months, a balance apparently much more than sufficient to allow of a payment of 50,000*l.* (the sum usually transferred at one time) into the Bank under the Act. The Commissioners state to your Committee, that demands upon them to the amount of not less than about 260,000*l.* were then outstanding; but this sum must obviously comprise the payments which were to be expected in a long succeeding period, for all the actual payments of the following 16 months (if a sum of 50,000*l.* paid to government on the 30th June 1796, and of 40,000*l.* transferred on 31st Dec. 1796 to the Commissioners, on account of commission, and of about 49,000*l.* paid to captors, which had been previously received from the East India Company for that purpose within the same period, are excepted) amounted to only about 143,000*l.* according to a statement of the Commissioners. These payments are undoubtedly no exact or very sure criterion of the sum which might fairly be considered on the 25th Feb. 1796, as likely to be wanted. They however furnish a strong presumption on the subject, and the circumstance of the 50,000*l.* just mentioned having been afforded to government, besides 40,000*l.* to the Commissioners, a few months after the 25th Feb. 1796, without producing a reduction of the balance below 150,000*l.* affords additional reason for thinking that there was no sufficient ground for objecting to make a payment into the Exchequer as desired. It is further observable, that the Commissioners in their statement on this subject to your Committee, omit to mention the sums which in Feb. 1796, they might expect to receive. The sums actually received in the first fifteen of the above-mentioned sixteen months, (exclusive of the 49,000*l.* which were both received from the East India Company, and paid over to captors as already stated) appear by a paper called for by your Committee, to have been more than equal to the sum paid in the corresponding period, if the before mentioned payments of 50,000*l.* to government and 40,000*l.* to the Commissioners are included. It is moreover observable, that a sum of from 86,000*l.* to 665,000*l.* (which in conformity to a clause in 35 Geo. 3. ch. 80. was gathering interest at 4 per cent.) lay in the hands of the East India Company from the beginning of March 1796 to March 1798, being the produce of sales made by them from time to time on account of the Commissioners, a part of which

fund, supposing a proper understanding on this subject to have subsisted between the Commissioners, the government, and the East India Company, might have been convertible to the purpose of supplying the Commissioners with the means of meeting some of the demands coming unexpectedly upon them. It is therefore on the whole presumable, that at the time of the application in question, a further augmentation of the large balance already in hand, rather than a diminution of it, was reasonably to be expected.—Your Committee cannot contemplate the magnitude of the balances as they appear in the cash book of the Commissioners, without expressing an opinion, that (supposing it allowable for the Commissioners to adopt that construction of the Act which they have given to it) these balances ought to have been made productive by investing a very large proportion of them in Exchequer bills for the benefit of the public. Probably not less than between 40 and 50,000*l.* would have accrued in the way of interest from a due attention to economy on the part of the Commissioners in this particular, and the employment of the chief part of their large cash for such a purpose would have constituted a much better apology than has been offered by them for withholding from the Bank the sums which the Act, according to the strict construction of it, required to be paid into it, and would unquestionably have been the most convenient arrangement.—In the year 1799, a sum of 27,000*l.* due to captors, was turned to this use, which, through the accumulation of interest, amounted to 38,553*l.* at the time when it was paid; and a sum of about 33,000*l.* has been obtained for interest on the balances in the hands of the East India Company.—It has indeed been discovered in the progress of these inquiries, that the Commissioners have availed themselves of the opportunity so obviously afforded them of rendering their balances productive, but that they employed them, during the years which preceded the completion of their sales, entirely with a view to their own emolument. They have invested a part of them in Exchequer bills, a part in India bonds, and a small part in the very exceptionable article of bills of exchange on private individuals, which they have discounted.—No minute was made of any Resolution of the Board to employ any part of the cash in hand in this manner, and no proof of such employment of it appears among the receipts and payments of the cash book; the balance

of which therefore do not exhibit, as they ought to do, the amount of cash in the hands of the Bank, and of the several bankers, but include the sum lent out at interest: neither has any trace of the transaction been exhibited in any account, nor any mention of it been made to government, except that at about the same time when it was stated to the Committee on Public Expenditure, the Treasury were furnished with a copy of the Statement. The Committee itself did not at once receive correct or explicit information on this point. It will appear by the papers and evidence annexed, that on the 2nd of March 1807, the Commissioners were directed (nearly in the same terms in which the heads of other offices were required to furnish their returns) to give an "Account of their Establishment and Names, how paid, Salary, Fees, and other Emoluments, and amount of their Receipts on an average of the last three years." The Commissioners stated in their return, that they had "no Salary, Fees or Emoluments, " they being paid the usual Commission "on the sale of the property placed under their care, out of which they paid salaries to clerks, and all other expences of their establishment;" and they proceeded to say, that "their sales having ceased from the year 1798, and consequently their commission also, they expected to be allowed, on the final settlement of their accounts, a reasonable remuneration for their services since that period." In an examination of one of the Commissioners which took place a week after, he having mentioned that "a sum had been invested for the benefit of captors," was thereupon asked, "What was the amount of the sum vested in Public Securities?" and he replied, "about 27,000*l.* for the captors, and the whole remainder is invested also in public securities, which we shall account for to government (when we close our accounts) with Interest."—In an explanatory Paper, delivered to the Committee a fortnight after this examination, the Commissioners, after stating, "that they have taken particular care from time to time not to retain a larger balance than was necessary to meet the exigencies to which they were liable," add, that "they have invested the greatest part of that money in public securities, with a view of making it productive while it remained in their hands." They then say, that "they consider themselves accountable to go-

"vernment for the Interest thus accruing." These expressions seem to your Committee to imply, that they considered themselves accountable to government for whatever interest they had at any time received by lending the balances in hand, with the exception only of that portion of interest for which they had represented themselves as accountable to captors. They further observe in this explanatory Paper, that "on the other hand, having received no commission since the year 1799, they conceive that the services they have since rendered will not be more than adequately compensated by that Interest, &c." But when the Commissioners were specifically required, by a subsequent Order of 9th March 1809, to render "an account of Interest and Benefit of any kind derived from the possession of any Money which, in virtue of their Commission, may from time to time have remained in their hands, and of which no account had been rendered to the Treasury," they took a distinction between two considerable sums, received by them for interest at different periods, the one a sum of about 18,000*l.* (or of about 16,000*l.* according to a subsequently corrected Statement) received for interest before the completion of their sales; the other, a sum of about 26,000*l.* received after that period; and they remarked, that "it is for the last of these sums that they have declared themselves ready to account," but that as to the smaller sum, first received, "they have only kept an account of it as between themselves." They have declared themselves unable to furnish, from their private papers, all the information which has been asked respecting the sum first received, but they confidently remark, that the profit thus made is not more than the sum stated.—They endeavour to establish their title to the sum first received partly by claiming interest on their balances as a privilege common to public accountants, and partly by observing, that the sum in question is not equal to certain sums which they had relinquished, though entitled to them. The chief sum said to be so relinquished is that part of their commission which had been applied by them to the payment of the expences of their establishment (amounting to about 15,000*l.*) from the burthen of supporting which they now claimed a right to be exempt, although, in their original Return, they had professed to charge themselves with it. Another sum, which they take credit for having

relinquished, consists of some commission which they forbore to charge to captors, but the reason assigned for this renunciation is one which your committee cannot countenance or approve.—Annexed is a Paper transmitted by one of the Commissioners, in explanation of the meaning of the expressions used in their first return; but, in the judgment of your Committee, it has not removed the ground of any of the preceding Observations.—Your Committee now proceed to the last point on which it is necessary to dwell, namely, the Amount and Mode of Remuneration which, under all the circumstances of the present case, seem the most proper to be adopted.—The following is the amount of the Profits which were stated on the 10th Feb. 1809, to have been received by the Commissioners :

Commission at five per-cent. on the gross proceeds of their sales, after paying charges of their establishment	$\text{£}74,137$
--	------------------

Brokerage	4,346
-----------	-------

Interest	36,458
----------	--------

Making together	$\text{£}114,941$
-----------------	-------------------

It was then also stated, that a further sum had been received, or was receivable, for Interest, which would make the profits of the Commissioners	124,785
---	---------

Subject to a deduction of	1,587
---------------------------	-------

Making	123,198
--------	---------

They have expected for Commission a further sum of about	10,000
--	--------

Making the total profits received, and expected, about	$\text{£}133,198$
--	-------------------

Much the larger part of their Commission has been charged on property sold for them by the East India Company, who, by a clause in 37 Geo. 3. c. 80. were allowed five-per-cent. for their expence in effecting such sales.—The Commissioners, in their first Return, have termed a commission of five-per-cent. on the gross proceeds of their sales, “the usual commission;” but two and a half per-cent. on the gross proceeds is the highest rate common among merchants, and is the rate charged by them in the case of goods sold through the medium of the East India Company. The interest which the Commissioners have derived from the great balance of cash in their hands is not warranted by mercantile practice, an exact

interest account being generally kept between merchants selling on commission and their employers, to whom indeed they frequently make large advances; and a commission of two and a half per-cent. is, therefore, to be considered as in some measure a recompence for that accommodation. It may be further remarked, that the extraordinary magnitude of the sales of the commissioners form a reasonable ground for keeping down the rate of commission. This principle was urged in the Report of the Committee on Public Offices upon the Bank, with a reference to the allowance made for the management of the public debt, and has been since acted upon; and it no less evidently applies to the present case.—But the grounds on which the Commissioners have preferred their claim to a Commission of five per-cent. on the gross proceeds in their more recent statements, have chiefly been, a precedent for that allowance, supposed to have been afforded in the case of a similar Commission issued in the war of 1756, and the general practice of prize agents.

—The Commissioners state themselves to have derived their intelligence on the former of these points from a conversation with the late Mr. Aufere, one of the commissioners in 1756, but their information is very imperfect and incorrect; and the Commissioner who gave Evidence before your Committee, professed not to know whether the commission was charged on the gross or on the net amount of the proceeds of the sales. It appears by some authentic documents on this subject, of which copies are annexed, that a commission of two and a half per-cent. on the net proceeds having been granted, out of which various undefined expences were to be defrayed, the commissioners represented these expences (which, according to their construction of the term, included brokerage and various other charges besides those of their establishment) to amount to more than their commission; and that a commission of two and a half per-cent. on the net proceeds of sales, independently of all expences, was consequently substituted. A copy of the entry in the account presented to the Treasury by the Auditor, after the termination of the transactions under this commission, is inserted in the Appendix, by which it appears that the total sum paid for commission was  $\text{£}14,768, 3s.$ —It was divided among 14 Commissioners.—The rate of commission charged by prize agents has been fixed by long usage at five per-cent.;

and has lately been applied by the law to the net proceeds of sale, having before been charged on the gross proceeds. It appears by the evidence, that the excess of the commission of prize agents above that of merchants is justified chiefly by the peculiar trouble imposed on the prize agent in the distribution of the proceeds of his sales among the crews of the capturing vessels, a trouble from which the Commissioners for the Sale of Dutch Property were exempt. If also the capital employed by the prize agent, and the responsibility and risk to which he is subject, are taken into consideration, little disparity between the two charges will be found.—Your Committee will now present an Estimate of the Remuneration, to which the Commissioners would be entitled according to each of the three principles which have been mentioned.—First, If the commission usual among merchants of two and a half per cent. on the *gross* proceeds of sales should be granted, about 50,000*l.* would be the amount of the allowance, out of which the expences of the Establishment (in all about 17,000*l.*) would be to be defrayed, leaving about 33,000*l.* clear profit to be divided among the Commissioners.—2dly. If the principle adopted in 1756, of two and a half per cent, on the *net* proceeds, (which may amount to about 1,300,000*l.* or 1,400,000*l.*) should be resorted to, a sum of about 32,500*l.* to 35,000*l.* would be receivable, which, the expences of the establishment being paid, would leave about 15,500*l.* to 18,000*l.* to be divided among the Commissioners.—3dly. If the commission should be calculated at the rate which was usual among prize agents at the time when the Commissioners began to act, namely, five per-cent. on the gross proceeds of sales, the sum would be about 99,000*l.* subject to a similar deduction, leaving a clear profit of about 82,000*l.*—Your Committee can by no means agree to decide the question according to this principle. The Commission received by prize agents at the time when the Commissioners were appointed, has lately been determined to be a more than adequate remuneration for the whole of their trouble. It should also be recollect that the Commissioners not only have been exempt from the labour of distributing the proceeds of their sales among the individual sailors concerned in the captures, and from much other trouble and responsibility, as well as from the advances to which prize agents are subject, but are also enabled, by the magnitude of the sum on

which their Commission is charged, to transact the public business at a much lower rate than is fairly due to individuals receiving ordinary consignments.—On the whole, your Committee recommend that a Commission of five per-cent. on the *net* proceeds of sales should be allowed to the Commissioners, they paying the charges of their establishment.—This allowance will probably amount to not less than about 50,000*l.* or 10,000*l.* to each Commissioner, and will be more by about 17,000*l.* than would be due to them, according to the usual practice of merchants, and more by at least about 32,000*l.* than they could claim according to the precedent of 1756, to which they have appealed.—The excess of this remuneration above that enjoyed by merchants, as well as above that granted in 1756, may be justified on the ground partly of the more than ordinary trouble imposed on the present Commissioners, and partly by the length of time during which their Commission has necessarily subsisted, and perhaps partly also by the circumstance of your Committee, in consequence of the omission not only of the Commissioners, but also of the government, having to recommend a retrospective arrangement. The sum which the Commissioners will have to refund, in case of the adoption of this suggestion, will be not less than between 60 and 70,000*l.* They will also fail to receive nearly 20,000*l.* which they appear to have expected to appropriate to their own use, for further interest and commission.—Your Committee cannot allow any weight to the observation, that two of the Commissioners having, after a term, quitted their professions with a view to the fulfilment of their trust, some reference should be made to this circumstance in estimating the amount of the remuneration. No notice of the intended sacrifice was given; and it is obvious, that by proportioning the general compensation receivable by the Body to the special claims of two Individuals, a more than adequate reward would be granted to the majority.—If it should be thought fit to adopt the suggestion of your Committee, the Commissioners ought to be credited in account for the proposed Commission, and to be debited for all sums applied to their own use, since they have been taken without due authority, the same general principles being observed by the auditors in the settlement of the concerns of these Commissioners which are usual in similar cases.—Your Committee further suggest, that the Commissioners should be directed

to use their utmost diligence to make up and transmif their accounts to the lords of his Majesty's Privy Council, with a view to their being submitted to the Board of Treasury, and by them referred to the Auditors.—Your Committee have not pursued their examination of all the topics to which their attention has been called, as will be seen by the evidence, partly because such investigation might detain them too long from their inquiries into other subjects, and partly on the ground of their not wishing to be considered as exempting the government from the duty of applying their attention to the transactions of the Commissioners, or the auditors from the diligent and exact performance of the functions of their important office. The magnitude of the charges on the vessels and cargoes sold, which manifests itself in the difference between the gross and the net proceeds, and in the excess of the charges above the whole proceeds in the case of many vessels, appear to demand attention.—Your Committee have had it chiefly in their view to examine and animadvert upon those points which derive importance either from the magnitude of the saving in question, or from their involving some general principles, on which it might be material to insist.—On a review of the whole of the subject which has been before them, they beg leave generally to remark, that to commit pecuniary trusts of extraordinary magnitude to persons, however respectable as individuals, and however qualified for their employment by the habits of their former lives, without settling, during a long course of years, the mode or amount of their remuneration,—without providing any material check on their proceedings,—and without reminding them of their responsibility by calling for any regular or periodical account, is a neglect which may be expected often to lead to equally prejudicial consequences, and is a deviation from the acknowledged duty, and also, as your Committee trust, from the ordinary practice of government.

#### PROCEEDINGS

*In COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &c. relative to the recent INQUIRY in the House of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK. (Continued from p. 568.)*

#### TOWN OF GODALMING.

At a Meeting of the Corporation and principal Inhabitants of the Town of Godalming, held at the Town Hall, in pursuance of a Requisition for that purpose, to the Warden of the Town, on Monday, the 27th day of March, 1809.

It was (with the exception of two only) unanimously resolved, That an Address from the Corporation and Inhabitants of this Town be forthwith prepared and presented to G. L. Wardle, esq., M. P. thanking him for the manly and patriotic spirit by which he so peculiarly distinguished himself as a Member of Parliament, in bringing forward and prosecuting the Inquiry in the House of Commons into the Conduct of the late Commander in Chief his Royal Highness the Duke of York.

That Mr. Weale the Warden, and Mr. Haydon, a Member of the said Corporation, be deputed to present such Address, and that they do forthwith consult Mr. Wardle as to the most convenient time for his receiving the same.

That these Resolutions be entered on the Records of the said Corporation, as a lasting memorial of the opinion entertained by the Corporation and Inhabitants of this Town of Mr. Wardle's Parliamentary Services, and as a Tribute of their grateful acknowledgments to him.

THE ADDRESS.  
To G. L. Wardle, esq. M. P.

*Godalming, 27th March, 1<sup>o</sup>09.*

SIR;—WE the undersigned Members of the Corporation, and principal Inhabitants of the Town of Godalming, this day assembled at the Town Hall, in pursuance of a Requisition for that purpose to the Warden of the Town, feeling convinced that Corruption in any Government must necessarily tend to weaken its own Just Authority, and admiring that manly and patriotic spirit by which you so peculiarly distinguished yourself as a Member in Parliament, in bringing forward and prosecuting the Inquiry in the House of Commons, into the Conduct of the late Commander in Chief, desire to offer you our most sincere and hearty thanks, and as a lasting memorial of the opinion we entertain of your Parliamentary Services, we have caused this Tribute of Acknowledgment to be entered on the Records of the said Corporation.

(Here follow the signatures.)

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 17.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 29, 1809.

[Price 1s.

" By the corruption of Parliament, and the absolute influence of a King, or his Minister, on the two Houses, we return into that state, to deliver or secure us from which Parliaments were instituted, and are really governed by the arbitrary will of one man. Our whole Constitution is at once dissolved. Many securities to liberty are provided, but the *Integrity*, which depends on the Freedom and Independence of Parliament, is the Key-stone that keeps the whole together. If this be shaken, our Constitution totters. If it be quite removed, our Constitution falls into ruin. That noble fabric, the pride of Britain, the envy of her neighbours, raised by the labour of so many centuries, repaired at the expense of so many millions, and cemented by such a profusion of blood; that noble fabric, I say, which was able to resist the united efforts of so many races of giants, may be demolished by a race of pygmies. The Integrity of Parliament is a kind of Palladium, a tutelary Goddess, who protects our state. When she is once removed, we may become a prey of any Enemies. No Agamemnon, no Achilles will be wanted to take our city: *Thersites* himself will be sufficient for such a conquest."—BOLINGBROKE.

641] [642

## HAMPSHIRE MEETING.

This Meeting, the Requisition for holding which was inserted in the present volume, at page 545, was held at Winchester, on the 25th instant; and, as I think the proceedings of great importance to the nation at large, I will here give a correct account of them. It is very well known, that, for a long time past, County-Meetings have been merely the work of party; and, in fact, that the Resolutions, or other things, emanating from such Meetings, have not contained the sentiments of the people of any county, any more than decisions, in another place, have corresponded with the sentiments of the nation at large. Therefore, it is necessary to give the history of this Meeting in Hampshire, from which history the nation will be able to judge of the weight which ought to be attached to the opinions and the decision of the Meeting. The *Speeches*, made upon this occasion, and which occupied nearly four hours in the delivery, it would be impossible to give here, nor would it be of much use, if I were able to do it, seeing that they have been published so much at length, in the STATESMAN and other daily papers, and seeing that the several clauses of the first Resolution do so fully express all the most material principles, maintained by those who spoke in support of that Resolution.—As to the origin of the Meeting, the history of that will be found at the page before referred to, and in the Address to the county, which I subjoined to the Requisition. What remains to be done is to give a faithful account of what took place, after the publishing of that Requisition and Address; which account I, as having had a considerable share in the business, owe to the county and to the public at large.—In the Address before

mentioned, I expressed a wish to see the leaders of both the political parties come to the meeting, and, laying aside all party considerations, join in taking that leading part, upon this occasion, which was suitable to their rank and property. That I was perfectly sincere in this wish an account of my conduct afterwards will clearly shew.—Having been informed, that the Earl of Northesk approved of the Meeting, I, after writing a letter to him, waited upon his lordship, at his own house, on the 15th of April, when I stated to him, in a very full manner, my sentiments as to what ought to be declared at the Meeting; I repeated my wish respecting the persons to take the lead, but added, that if Mr. Powlett chose it, I thought, the propositions, whatever they might be, ought to come from him.—To the same effect I had before written to Mr. Powlett himself.—On the 24th, when I had requested to wait upon Lord Northesk again, he did me the honour to call upon me, and to inform me, that Mr. Powlett had prepared some Resolutions to be offered to the Meeting. I then shewed him the Resolution, which I had just drawn up (and which was passed at the Meeting), upon which he gave no opinion whatever. In his lordship's presence I then, enclosed a copy of that Resolution in a letter to Mr. Powlett; and as I understood that Mr. Herbert was at Mr. Powlett's house, I requested the latter to shew the Resolution to the former, at the same time distinctly stating in my letter, that, if none of them chose to move that Resolution, or something substantially the same, I should think it my duty to do it.—By the bearer of my letter Mr. Powlett sent me word, that he would meet me at the George Inn at Winchester, the next morning at ten o'clock.

He came at about half past eleven; and, as there was no time to lose (the Meeting being to be held at twelve o'clock) I immediately went into the room where he was, and where, at my request, his Resolutions, which will be found below, were read, in the presence of Lord Northesk, Mr. Bonham of Petersfield, and Mr. Budd, of Newbury. I frankly declared to him, that they did not meet my approbation, and that I was morally certain, that the Meeting would view them in the same light; and I added, in nearly these words: “as we have not a moment to lose, and as “straight lines in politics, as well as in “geometry, are the shortest, I will frankly “tell you, Sir, that if those Resolutions “are offered to the Meeting, I shall move “to set the whole of them aside, and to “substitute my Resolution in their place.” After a few words more, I and Mr. Budd walked out, leaving Mr. Bonham and Lord Northesk with Mr. Powlett, the former of whom, we were in hopes, would have prevailed upon Mr. Powlett to take what I proposed instead of his own.

—Here ended the communications between us.—Just before I saw Mr. Powlett, I had, by mere accident, seen Mr. Chamberlayne of Weston, and whom I had not seen, or had any communication with, for a year and a half before. Mr. Chamberlayne, who was sitting down to breakfast, said to me, in his usual frank manner, “come, Cobbett, let's see what you have “got to propose to this Meeting to-day.”

—“There,” said I, “take the paper “and read it, while I run down to Mr. “Powlett, who is just come in.”—The moment I left Mr. Powlett, I went back to Mr. Chamberlayne, who told me that he most cordially approved of every word in the Resolution. I then gave him an account of what had taken place between me and Mr. Powlett, and added: “if “they should render it necessary for me “to move this Resolution as an amend-“ment, will you second me?” To which he answered, “I will.”—Not another word passed between us; nor did I even see him again, till he stepped forward, and, in a speech which deserved and which received unbounded applause, fulfilled his promise.—I have thought it right to state all the circumstances, in order to shew, first, that, from beginning to end, I did all that I could possibly do, to avoid the necessity of being myself the person to take the lead at the Meeting, and to leave that office in the hands of those, to whom it would be more natural for the \*

county to look up; secondly, to shew, that Mr. Chamberlayne and I had not (as being near neighbours it might be supposed we had) been contriving any operation for the day of meeting, and, in justice to Mr. Chamberlayne's talents as well as his motives, to show that he had had no time whatever to frame a speech for the occasion; thirdly, to show, that there was, on our part, no trick, nothing done underhand, nothing, from beginning to end, which could be construed into a design, or a wish, to induce the Meeting to adopt any thing, which did not perfectly correspond with their own opinions and wishes; and, fourthly, to show to the nation at large, that the Resolution, passed at the Meeting, does contain the free and unbiased sentiments of that Meeting, the like of which Meeting Winchester had not seen, I believe, within the memory of man, and certainly not for many years past.—The Meeting was opened in the usual place; but that being instantly filled, I proposed an adjournment to the great Hall of the Castle. Even that, however, being thought too confined a space, it was determined to adjourn to the Grand Jury Chamber, as a place to speak from, while the audience took their station in the court-yard of the Castle.—The number of persons present, exclusive of comers and goers of the town, might be from eighteen hundred to two thousand, as nearly as I could guess. They consisted chiefly of the principal tradesmen and yeomanry from all parts of the county, persons able to spare the time and to afford the expence of carriages and horses; nor should it be forgotten, that, except the time of harvest, a more busy season of the year could not have been fixed on.—We saw, upon this occasion, none of that rabble that follow the heels of an election candidate for the sake of a little dirty drink; we heard no senseless bawling on one side or the other; no squads of hirelings to hiss or to applaud; what we had the pleasure to behold from the Grand-Jury Chamber windows that day, was, an assembly of sober, intelligent men of property, a fair representation of the sense and the integrity of this county; and, therefore, the decision cannot fail to have great weight with the kingdom at large, especially when it is considered, that the discussion lasted for nearly four hours, that ample opportunity was afforded to every one to express his sentiments, and that the regularity of the whole of the proceedings of the Meeting (aided as it was by the con-

spicuous ability as well as the strict impartiality of the High Sheriff) might afford an example even to assemblies, whose proceedings, down to minute particulars, are regulated by orders having the force of law.—Such was the assembly to whom the Resolutions were submitted, and I now proceed to insert those Resolutions, beginning with those proposed by Mr. Powlett, whose motion was seconded by the Honourable William Herbert; and this I do, in order to put upon record what the Meeting rejected as well as what they adopted.

“Resolved, That his Majesty’s Ministers, “by their attempt to deter the Mover of “the late Inquiry, by threats of disgrace “and infamy, by their conduct during its “progress, and by their influence which “they exerted at its conclusion, have sa- “crificed the true interests of the Crown, “treated with contempt the opinion and “the Rights of the People, and proved “themselves unworthy the Confidence of “their Country.

“Resolved, That it is expedient that “Parliament should take into their serious “consideration the great and increasing “Expenditure of the State, by which the “means of Corruption are multiplied, and “immediately adopt the most effectual “mode of retrenching all Profusion of the “Public Money, and diminishing the in- “fluence of Ministers over the Electors of “the Kingdom and their Representatives.

“Resolved, That the discovery of “abuses will prove of little permanent “advantage, unless followed by further “Inquiry and Reform, as the only means “of transmitting to Posterity that Consti- “tution, which is the pride of every Bri- “ton, and the admiration of the World.

“Resolved, That the late Inquiry in “Parliament has proved, beyond the pos- “sibility of doubt, the existence of Abuses “of a most ruinous tendency, in various “Departments of the State.

“Resolved, That G. L. WARDLE, Esq. “by his manly and patriotic Efforts in “the late Inquiry, has rendered an im- “portant service to his Country, is enti- “tled to the Praise of all honest and inde- “pendent Men, and merits the grateful “Thanks and warmest Approbation of “this Meeting.

“Resolved, That the Thanks of this “Meeting are particularly due to the “Minority of 125 who supported the “Motion of G. L. WARDLE, Esq. and to “those, who, though differing in minute “particulars from the Hon. Mover, had “the Honesty and Courage to oppose the

“Attempt of his Majesty’s Ministers to “exculpate the late Commander in Chief, “and shewed, by their Votes, a Convic- “tion in their Minds of Abuses in the “State, and a firm Determination to resist “them.”

These Resolutions were objected to by me for several reasons: generally, because they were an inadequate expression of the sentiments, which I thought ought to be expressed, upon the occasion; and, particularly, because they omitted to express distinguished approbation of the conduct of those members of parliament, who had acted a distinguished part in support of Mr. Wardle, and also of those Hampshire members, by name, who had voted in the minority of 125, while all the other Hampshire members had been either absent, or had voted against Mr. Wardle upon that most interesting occasion; but, with regard to this point, I objected to the Resolutions, in a more pointed manner, and without being able to suppress my indignation, seeing that they omitted the names of SIR FRANCIS BURDETT and LORD FOLKESTONE, without whose support and assistance, the whole nation must be convinced, that it would have been impossible for Mr. Wardle to have proceeded on to that success, which attended his most excellent exertions.—He, I am certain, is the last man in England to deny this: he has repeatedly acknowledged it in the House; and would it not be shameful for us to endeavour to suppress so important a truth?

—Though Sir Francis Burdett was, by illness, prevented from attending during great part of the examinations, does not every one perceive the great weight which was given to the charges by his *seconding* the motion for inquiry? And, as to Lord Folkestone, not only did he firmly stand by Mr. Wardle, when the whole of one side of the House, and many on the other side of the House, were openly and violently assaulting him, and endeavouring to run him down; but his lordship had the merit of bringing to light himself, one very important branch of the subjects of inquiry, namely, *the Loan transaction with Kennett*. And, were these two gentlemen to be merely huddled into the 125, without any particular mark of approbation? And, were Mr. Whitbread and those by whose exertions of eloquence so much was achieved to pass without being particularly named? Besides, and I beg the reader to mark it, if these Resolutions had passed, *Sir Francis Burdett* would not have

been thanked by us at all ; for, though he spoke, almost at the risk of his life, during the debate ; though he did that while he actually leant upon his crutch, he was unable to go to *vote* on the night of the division, and, of course, was not one of the hundred and twenty five, to whom Mr. Powlett and Mr. Herbert wished the meeting to confine their thanks.—But, this was what we had to expect, if Mr. Powlett suffered himself to be led into any thing belonging to *party*, of which it is very notorious that Sir Francis Burdett is the great and declared enemy ; this was to be expected from men, who should still cling to either party, and who had heard Sir Francis Burdett, in the House as well as out of it, declare, over and over again, that he liked one of the factions just as well as the other ; and, this was to be expected from such persons in Hampshire more than any where else. To such persons here it must have been deadly to propose thanks to Sir Francis Burdett, when they recollect that, at the election of 1806, one party had, in hand-bills published for the express purpose, accused the other of having his *good wishes*, and that the other, in a counter-hand-bill, had vowed to God, that they held his good wishes in abhorrence, and added, as a proof of this, that one of their candidates, Mr. Chute, had gone off, post-haste, to Middlesex to vote against Sir Francis, and for that very Mr. Mellish, who has now been censured by the unanimous voice of Middlesex for having voted against Mr. Wardle ; aye, that very Mr. Wardle, to whom both factions, at our meeting, were willing to give thanks.—To both parties, therefore, it must have been singularly mortifying, to see such a numerous and respectable meeting ; to see, in fact, the good sense, the justice, and public virtue of the county, voting, in the same place where their hand-bills had been distributed against sir Francis Burdett ; voting, after the most full and attentive hearing, *thanks to that same Sir Francis Burdett !*—Aye, last Tuesday's proceedings have convinced them, unless their minds are for ever shut against the light of truth and reason, that the people, the real people, of this county, are completely undeceived ; that they now know who are their *real friends*, and that any attempt to restore the influence of delusion will be, and must be, unsuccessful.—I objected, further, to these Resolutions, because one of them was exclusively levelled against the *present ministry* ; and, Sir Henry Mild-

may very truly observed, though it did not call upon us to praise the *Opposition*, and to express our wish for a change of ministry, it did, in fact, amount to the same thing.—The grounds, upon which I endeavoured to convince the Meeting of the propriety of adopting the Resolution, which it fell to my lot, though contrary to my wish, to have the honour of proposing, are so fully stated in that Resolution itself, that it will be quite unnecessary for me to dwell upon them here ; and, therefore, I shall now insert that Resolution, together with the others that were passed by the Meeting, and afterwards add a few words by way of concluding the history of the transactions of this memorable day.

“ At a Meeting of the Freeholders and other Landholders, and the Inhabitants in general of the County of Southampton, holden at the Castle of Winchester, on the 25th April, 1809, the HIGH SHE-“ RIFF of the County in the Chair ;

“ RESOLVED, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Gwyllim Lloyd Wardle, esq., for having instituted the recent Inquiry in the House of Commons relative to the Conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York ; for having, unconnected with, and unsupported by, any faction or party, prosecuted that laudable undertaking with talent and zeal, temper and perseverance, rarely to be met with ; and especially for having had the resolution thus to discharge his duty, in defiance of the threats of the King’s Servants, and in spite of the prejudices endeavoured to be excited against his Charges, through the false and hypocritical pretence that they proceeded from a Jacobin Conspiracy, a pretence which, for many years past, has been the best ally of corruption, and through the means of which pretence, artful and wicked men have but too long stifled the voice of truth, have abused the ear and drained the purses of this unsuspecting and loyal nation :—That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir F. Burdett, bart., who seconded Mr. Wardle’s motion for the Inquiry, and also to lord viscount Folkestone, for the active and zealous assistance which his Lordship afforded Mr. Wardle during the whole of the proceedings connected therewith ; and to both of these Gentlemen for their able and constitutional speeches in the discussion upon Mr. Wardle’s Motion of the 8th of March, and the subsequent discussions, arising out of the evi-

“ dence taken during the said Inquiry: — That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to lords viscount Milton and Althorpe; to lord Stanley; to the hon. T. Brand, and W. H. Lyttleton; to sir S. Romilly, and sir T. Turton; to major-general Ferguson; and to S. Whitbread, J. C. Curwen, T. W. Coke, H. Martin, J. Calcraft, and C. W. W. Wynne, esquires, who during the discussions aforementioned, stood forward the advocates of impartial justice; and also to the Minority of 125, who divided in favour of Mr. Wardle’s motion, amongst whom we, as Hampshiremen, observe with pleasure and with pride, the names of sir H. Mildmay, bart., and of Admiral Markham, and Newton Fellowes, esq., while we, though not with very great surprise, observe, and trust that the fact will be remembered, that the name of neither of the Members for this County does appear upon that honourable list: — That, in the course of the above-named Inquiry, acts of meanness, profligacy, and corruption, unparalleled, as we firmly believe, in the history of any Government in the world, have been brought to light, and proved to our perfect conviction; and that while we, as Englishmen and loyal subjects, cannot help feeling sorrow and shame at seeing the Son, and indignation at seeing so many of the Servants, of our Sovereign, involved in such scandalous transactions, we cannot, as men setting a proper value upon religious instruction and example, help entertaining the same feelings, and, if possible in an aggravated degree, at seeing deeply implicated in those transactions, no less than five Ministers of the Established Church; nor can we refrain from an expression of our anxious hope, that the Clergy in general (following, in this respect, the example of the two Reverend Gentlemen who signed the Requisition for this Meeting), will lose no opportunity of inculcating an abhorrence of such practices, and thereby of shewing, that the Church, like her Founder, is no respecter of persons, and that her endowments are not received as the wages of dependence and sycophancy, but as the worthy hire of the labourer in the vineyard of Christian piety, and of private and public virtue: — That in adverting to the cause of the injurious and disgraceful acts, thus revealed and demonstrated, this Meeting cannot help observing, that in the Act of Parliament, commonly called the Act

of Settlement, in virtue of which Act and of which Act only, his Majesty’s Family was raised to the throne of this kingdom, it is declared, ‘That no person who has an office, or place of profit, under the King, or receives a pension from the Crown, shall be capable of serving as a Member of the House of Commons;’ but that, notwithstanding the wise precaution of this Act, which is one of our great constitutional laws, and which, as its preamble expresses, was made ‘For the further Limitation of the Crown, and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject,’ it appears from a Report laid before the House of Commons in the Month of Jane last, in consequence of a Motion made by lord Cochrane, that there are in that House Seventy-eight Placemen and Pensioners, who, though part of what they receive is not stated, are, in the said Report, stated to receive £178,994 a year out of the Taxes raised upon the people, and, of course, out of the money to watch over the expenditure of which they are appointed: — That, if any doubt could have remained, as to the baneful effects of such a state of the House of Commons, that doubt must have been removed by the rejection of Mr. Wardle’s above-mentioned proposition, in the teeth of the clearest and most conclusive evidence, positive as well as circumstantial, written as well as verbal; and upon which occasion it appeared that all the King’s Ministers, all the Placemen, and all the Pensioners then present, voted against the said position: — That, in the Act of Parliament, commonly called the Bill of Rights, it is declared, ‘That the election of Members of Parliament ought to be free,’ and, in the same Act it is declared, ‘That the violating of the freedom of elections of Members to serve in Parliament,’ was one of the crimes of King James the 2nd, and one of the grounds upon which he was driven from the Throne of this Kingdom; but that, notwithstanding this law, which is said to be one of the great bulwarks of the Constitution, and notwithstanding divers other laws, made for the purpose of preventing undue returns of Members of Parliament, it does appear, from evidence given during the above-said Inquiry, that Lord Clancarty and Lord Viscount Castlereagh, both of them Servants of the King, and the latter a Privy Counsellor, a Secretary of State, and a Mem-

“ ber of the House of Commons, did offer “ to give a Writership in the East Indies, “ in Exchange for a Seat in the House of “ Commons, and that the failure of that “ corrupt negociation was owing, not to “ any disinclination on their part, but on “ the part of the seat-seller, to whom “ the offer was made:—That this Meet- “ ing have observed, that during a debate “ in the House of Commons, on the 20th “ of this month, upon the subjects of the “ aforesaid Inquiry, Thomas Creevey, Esq. “ one of the honourable Minority of 125, “ did distinctly state, that, it was not only “ his belief, but that it was within his own “ knowledge, that Seats in Parliament had “ been bought and sold; that the Treasury “ not only openly bought and sold those “ Seats, but kept, in a great degree, a mo- “ nopoly of the market, and that it was “ perfectly well known, that a dissolution “ of Parliament was not an appeal to the “ people, but an appeal to the Treasury; “ and that this Meeting have further ob- “ served, that, in answer to this statement “ of Mr. Creevey (for which that Gentle- “ man is entitled to our particular thanks), “ the King’s Minister, Mr. Perceval, did “ not attempt to deny the facts alledged, “ but contented himself with insinuating, “ that the opposite party, when in power, “ had been guilty of similar practices: “ —That, from the foregoing facts, as “ well as from numerous others, notorious “ to the whole nation, this Meeting have a “ firm conviction, that it is in the House “ of Commons, as at present constituted, “ that exists the great and efficient cause “ of that profligacy of manners amongst so “ many in high life; of that corrupt dis- “ posal of offices; of that endless train of un- “ punished peculations; of that squander- “ ing of our earnings and incomes; of that “ establishment of an army of foreigners “ in the heart of our country; of that in- “ capacity in the conducting of public “ affairs, both at home and abroad; and of “ all that national misery and disgrace “ which have been but too long so se- “ verely felt, and the dangers to be ap- “ prehended from which have now at- “ tracted the serious attention of even the “ most thoughtless and unobserving:— “ That, therefore, this Meeting, anxious “ alike for the preservation of his Majes- “ ty’s Throne and legitimate authority, “ and for the restoration of the rights and “ liberties bequeathed them by the wis- “ dom, the fortitude, and the valour of “ their forefathers, hold it a duty which “ they owe to their Sovereign and his suc-

cessors, to themselves and their chil- “ dren, to the safety, happiness, and re- “ nown of their country, to declare their “ decided conviction, that no change for “ the better can reasonably be expected, “ without such a Reform in the Commons “ House of Parliament, as shall make that “ House, in reality as well as in name, the “ Representatives of the People, and not “ the instruments in the hands of a Minis- “ ter; and further to declare, that it will “ be expedient for us, at a future con- “ venient time, to assemble in County- “ Meeting, in order to consider of a Pe- “ tition to the King, praying that his Ma- “ jesty will be graciously pleased to afford “ us his Royal countenance and support in “ our constitutional efforts against a faction “ of borough mongers, not less hostile to “ the true dignity and just prerogatives of “ his Majesty’s Crown, than to the in- “ terests and feelings of his faithful, suf- “ fering, and insulted people.

“ RESOLVED unanimously, That the “ Thanks of this Meeting be given to Wm. “ Powlett Powlett and Wm. Cobbett, Es- “ quires, for the part they respectively “ took in calling the Meeting, and for “ their conduct thereat.

“ RESOLVED unanimously, That the “ Thanks of this Meeting be given to “ the High Sheriff, for his readiness in “ convening the same, and for the impar- “ tiality with which he presided.

“ RESOLVED unanimously, That these “ Resolutions be signed by the Sheriff, in “ the name, and on behalf of the Meeting, “ and that the same be printed and pub- “ lished in the County Papers, and in the “ Statesman, the Morning Chronicle, the “ Times, and the Courier London News- “ papers; and that the Sheriff be requested “ to forward the Vote of Thanks to Gwyl- “ lym Lloyd Wardle, Esq.

“ Signed on behalf of the Meeting, “ JOHN BLACKBURN, Sheriff.”

---

Now, before I advert to some of the objections which were urged against the Resolution which I proposed, let me put upon record the fact, that there appeared to be for it *almost the whole* of the Meeting. The question was, in consequence of a very judicious choice of the High Sheriff, to be decided by the *holding up of hats*, and the hats, in some parts of the area, were, *for* the Resolution, so thick as not only to touch one another, but to be held one over another; whereas for the Resolutions pro- posed by Mr. Powlett, there were, I believe, only *eight* hats held up. Several

gentlemen said, that there were only five. It is, in so short a space of time, and so wide a surface for the eye to cover, very difficult to speak positively; but, I think, I could safely aver, that there were not more than ten, one of which was the hat of Mr. Powlett's own groom, who had laid the modesty to keep on the outskirts of the Meeting.—I do not thus state particulars, because it is a proof of a triumph to me; but, because it is a proof of the triumph of the good-sense, the sound principles, and the public-spirit of the county. I do not state them as any mark of the county's disregard for Mr. Powlett, who is deservedly an object of respect with the whole county, and especially with the yeomanry, who formed so large a portion of the Meeting; but, as a proof, that even the partiality which such a gentleman could not fail to create in favour of any motion, was not sufficient to induce the county to adopt a motion which they thought insufficient for the purpose of expressing those political sentiments, which, upon this important occasion, it appeared their evident duty to express.—I know that Mr. CHAMBERLAYNE wants no praise; but, I am sure I should disappoint the county if I did not say, that his speech was one of the best ever delivered in any place, and so far surpassing any thing ever before heard at a County Meeting, as to be beyond all competition. In manner as well as in matter it was equally an object of admiration. The whole of the proceedings will be given in an Evening London paper, the STATESMAN, where, of course, Mr. Chamberlayne's speech will find a conspicuous place; but, though a very able short-hand writer was present for the purpose of making a correct report, I am certain, before I see that report, that it is impossible for even that gentleman to do complete justice to this admirable speech. To be sure, it was the most lucky of all accidents, that Mr. Chamberlayne should happen to drop into the Inn just at the moment when he did. If I had had to choose through the whole county, and, as far as I know, through the whole kingdom, for a man to lend the weight of his character as well as of his talents to any effort of mine, I could not have selected such another man. This was what I thought the moment I had the good fortune to see him; this was what was said by every one after the Meeting was over; and this was what our opponents most sensibly and severely felt.—The county has also to thank Mr. JONES

of Sway, who made a very excellent speech in support of the Resolution, and whose talents cannot, upon future occasions, fail to be of great use in effecting that reform, without which nothing of real utility will have been done.—Sir HENRY MILDMAX, who was received in the most flattering manner by the Meeting as a young man, who had had the spirit and the sense to break from the trammels of the county factions, disapproved of the Resolutions of Mr. Powlett as breathing a party spirit; and of mine he disapproved, in as far as they conveyed a tacit censure upon the two county members, one of whom, *Mr. Chute*, was from illness unable to attend his duty in Parliament, at the time when the 125 gave their votes. Mr. BIGG WITHER stated the same about Mr. Chute's illness, and, with modesty quite equal to his judgment, said, that, on the part of the other member, *Mr. Heathcote*, he should appeal from that Meeting to the *freeholders*; that is to say, to the Dock-yards, the Barracks, the Custom-house, and to all the swarm of creatures, who are held in slavery by a dependence upon the ministry for bread. The REV. MR. POUTTER (who, as the reader will, probably, remember, sometime ago wrote me a letter in defence of his friend, Mr. Garnier) said nearly the same about Mr. Chute's illness, though he seemed to allow, that that gentleman was out a *fox-hunting* on the day when the memorable division took place. MR. PORTAL corroborated what had been said about this illness; and said further, that Mr. Chute, at the time alluded to, only rode to the cover, in his great coat, and saw the hounds *throw off*, but took no part in the chase. We might, if we had thought of it, have reminded them, that SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, whom they refused to thank at all, went on that same day, and spoke in the House of Commons upon crutches; but, we contented ourselves with stating that all that we proposed to the Meeting, upon the score of Mr. Chute, was, to declare that his name was not in the list of the 125; and that, when that acknowledged truth had been declared by a Vote of the Meeting, we had no objection to Mr. Chute's friends proposing, in a separate Resolution, a declaration of the fact of his *inability* to attend parliament at the time referred to. This they did; but, though MR. NEVILLE of Easton added himself to the other vouchers for this fact, the Meeting, without any body's speaking against it, negatived the motion, and for this plain reason, that a man, who was able to ride so far in

the morning to see his hounds throw off, must have been able to go to London in a carriage and to give his vote upon so important an occasion, than which nothing could be more characteristic of the justice and good-sense of the Meeting; and, I cannot help noticing, as an instance of their discernment, that when Mr. Neville said, “*a fact, a fact, gentlemen; we only call upon you to resolve upon a fact,*” numerous voices exclaimed: “Yes, but we don’t know the fact to be true.”—Sir Henry Mildmay objected to that part of the Resolution, which related to *Lords Clancarty and Castlereagh*, upon the ground, that they were as yet *under trial* in the House of Commons; but, upon my bringing out the book of Evidence printed by order of that House, the Meeting thought themselves full as able to form a correct opinion, and *full as likely to pass a just sentence*, as the House of Commons were; and, a hundred voices at once issued from the assemblage, reminding Sir Henry Mildmay of certain late decisions.—These objections having been got over, there was another of the Rev. Mr. Poulter to the form of our proceedings. He contended, that the Resolution introduced matters, to agitate which the Meeting was not called, and in support of which objection he appealed to the chair; but this objection the High Sheriff overruled upon the ground of the comprehensiveness of the Requisition, which certainly allowed us to discuss and to express our sentiments upon the remedy as well as the disease.—Mr. Poulter gave into a good deal of personality, and brought what he appears to have looked upon as a pretty antithesis about the *Crown and Mitre* reposing in more security in the sun-shine of Pall Mall than amidst the damp banks of Botley; but, besides that Botley is well-known to be one of the driest and most healthy spots in the country, while Pall-Mall is for half the year smothered with smoke and fog, the jest had been rendered pointless by the sentiments which I had uttered about the king and his family, and after which any man in this whole world, except Mr. Poulter, would have been restrained from making such an attempt at personal sarcasm; and which attempt, as all his friends foresaw it would, brought upon him those scoffs, that general expression of contempt, to which I was sincerely sorry to see a gentleman of his sacred calling expose himself, and towards the producing of which every one present will do me the justice

to say, that I did not, in the smallest degree, contribute, contenting myself, as I did, with simply appealing to the Meeting, whether Botley had that day sent forth any thing indicative of hostility or disrespect to either Bishops or Kings.

—An attempt was afterwards made to divide the Resolution, making each clause a distinct resolution, and, of course, taking the sense of the Meeting upon each separately. To this I objected, upon the same ground that I have frequently given my opinion, that what Mr. Wardle has done is *nothing unless more be done*; and, that it is perfect nonsense to thank any one for telling you of your *disease*, unless his so doing leads to the pointing out of a *remedy*.—Here the objections stopped, the question was put, and the decision was what I have before stated.

---

There are several very important subjects, which I should have touched upon in this Number; but, I have not had time.—The Resolution passed in Hampshire is of great consequence in a *national* point of view; and, therefore, it was necessary to give a minute of its origin and progress; because, without minute particulars, it is impossible for those not present to form a correct judgment of the real value of the thing itself.

\* \* \* In consequence of several Letters which I have received from distant parts of the country, I am induced to continue open the **SUBSCRIPTION FOR THE MISS TAYLORS**, till Saturday the 13th of May, when it will positively be closed.

---

## COBBETT'S Parliamentary Debates:

The Subscribers to the above Work are respectfully informed that the Twelfth Volume is in a state of considerable forwardness.

---

## COBBETT'S Parliamentary History of ENGLAND,

Which, in the compass of Sixteen Volumes, Royal Octavo, will contain a full and accurate Report of all the recorded Proceedings, and of all the Speeches in both Houses of Parliament, from the earliest times to the year 1803, when

the publication of "Cobbett's Parliamentary Debates" commenced.

The Subscribers to the above work are respectfully informed, that the Fifth Volume will be delivered on Monday next, the 1st of May. It embraces the period from the Revolution in the year 1688, to the Accession of QUEEN ANNE, in the year 1702. For this period, the materials, as well for the Proceedings as the Debates, have been, for the most part, collected from the following Works : 1. The Journals of the House of Lords ; 2. The Journals of the House of Commons ; 3. The Debates of the House of Commons, from 1688 to 1694, collected by the Honourable Anchitell Grey, who was forty years member for the town of Derby ; 4. The Debate between the Lords and the Commons, at a Free Conference, held in the Painted Chamber, in the Session of the Convention, in 1688, relating to the words, "*Abdicated*," and "*the Vacancy of the Throne*," used in the Vote of the Commons ; 5. A Collection of the Debates and Proceedings in Parliament, in 1694 and 1695, upon the Inquiry into the late Briberies and corrupt Practices, printed in the year 1695 ; 6. Proceedings in the House of Commons against Sir John Fenwick, printed in the year 1698 ; 7. Timberland's History and Proceedings of the House of Lords ; and 8. Chandler's History and Proceedings of the House of Commons.—Here again, as in former Volumes, recourse has been had to the best historians and contemporary writers ; and, amongst others, to Burnet, Echard, Kennet, Oldmixon, Ralph, Tindal, Boyer, and Somerville. The Hardwicke Papers have also been consulted ; as also the State Tracts, and the Harleian Collection.—There is subjoined, by way of Appendix, a Collection of very scarce and valuable Parliamentary Tracts, taken from those of Lord Sommers, the Harleian Miscellany, and the Collection of State Tracts published during the reign of William the Third.

#### PROCEEDINGS

*In COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &c. relative to the recent INQUIRY in the House of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK. (Continued from p. 640.)*

#### TOWN AND PORT OF SANDWICH.

At a General Meeting of the Freemen and Inhabitants of the Town and Port of Sandwich, in the county of Kent, held in the Guildhall in the said Town and Port, on Friday, the 7th day of April, 1809.

J. HARRISON, esq. Mayor, in the Chair.

Resolved unanimously, on the motion of Mr. J. Fowle, seconded by Mr. Robt. Curling, that the Thanks of this Meeting be presented to G. L. Wardle, esq., member of parliament for Oakhampton, for having brought forward in the honourable House of Commons an Enquiry into the Conduct of his Royal Highness the late Commander in Chief, for his firm and unremitting perseverance in establishing the Charges, and for his strenuous endeavours to check the further progress of improper influence and corruption.—That we think it our duty on this occasion to express ourselves firm in our loyalty and attachment to our King and Constitution.

Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the Mayor, for his readiness in calling the Meeting, and his impartiality in the Chair.—Ordered that the above Resolutions be inserted in the Courier and Canterbury Papers.—By Order of the Meeting.—GEO. GARRETT, Clerk.

#### BURGH OF ANNAN.

At a Meeting of the Burgesses and other Inhabitants of the Burgh of Annan, held the 11th of April, 1809, for the purpose of expressing their sentiments on the late Investigation into the Conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York as Commander in Chief of the Army of this country ; Mr. James Scott, one of the Baileys of the said Burgh, in the Chair :

1. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq., M.P. for his able and intrepid exertions, in detecting and dragging into public view, the flagrant system of corruption, which for some years has prevailed in the disposal of military promotions. (*To be continued.*)

#### EAST INDIA COMPANY.

*REPORT from the Committee of the House of Commons, on the Patronage of the East India Company.—Ordered to be printed 23rd March, 1809.*

The Select Committee, appointed to inquire into the existence of any Corrupt Practices, in regard to the Appointment and Nomination of Writers or Cadets in the Service of the East India Company ; or any Agreement, Negotiation, or Bargain, direct or indirect, for the sale thereof ; and to report the same, as it shall appear to them, to the House, together with their Observations thereupon ; and who were empowered to report the Minutes of Evidence taken be-

fore them ; and their Proceedings, from time to time, to the House,

Began their investigation by examining into a Case brought before them by Geo. Woodford Thellusson, esq. a member of this house, in which his patronage and confidence appear to have been grossly abused.—The whole Evidence being given at length in the Appendix, your Committee content themselves with inserting in this place, a short abstract only of this, and every other transaction ; giving the names of the persons appointed, of those by whom they were recommended, and by whom their nominations were signed, together with the names of the intermediate agents in any of the negotiations where money was paid or received.—Those appointments which have been completed in consequence of any such bargains, and upon which satisfactory evidence has been produced, will be placed first ; a second class will be found of nominations which appear to have taken effect, but with regard to which, from the death of some of the parties, or from deficiency of proof in other particulars, your Committee are unable to ascertain the names of the persons who were sent out to India. It is a satisfaction to your Committee, throughout the whole evidence, to remark nothing which traces any one of these corrupt or improper bargains to any Director, or induces a reasonable suspicion that it was done with the privity or connivance of any member of that court. Several negotiations which never took effect, will be found alluded to, or detailed in parts of the evidence ; which it was thought proper not to reject under the comprehensive directions “that your Committee should inquire into any agreement, negotiation, or bargain, direct or indirect, for the sale of such nomination ;” and when such information was received, they deemed it inexpedient to withhold it from this house, though they are fully aware that their desire of opening every channel of inquiry has led to an extent of examination, and to a mass of evidence, from which much might be retrenched without detriment, if it had been easy to establish a satisfactory principle of omission, or abridgment, which might have left nothing wholly irrelevant or trifling, while it comprehended whatever might be interesting either to this house, or to the East India Company.

**WRITERS.**—Mr. Ed. Js. Smith was nominated a Writer to Bengal in the season 1806-7, by Mr. G. W. Thellusson ; the appointment was given to his first cousin,

Mr. Emperor J. A. Woodford, who sold the appointment for 3,500*l.* through the agency of Mr. Tahourdin, solicitor, who received 100*l.* out of that sum. The other persons concerned in this negotiation were Mr. Wimbourn and Mr. Laing.

Mr. Fry Magniac was nominated Writer to Bengal in the year 1807-8, by Mr. G. W. Thellusson ; this appointment was also given to the same Mr. Woodford, and sold through the agency of Mr. Tahourdin. Mr. Beale was the purchaser, and the sum paid by him was 3,500 guineas, of which Mr. Woodford received 3,000*l.* Mr. Tahourdin 150*l.*; the remainder was divided between Mr. Donovan and Mr. Garrat.

Mr. Henry Gardiner was nominated a Writer to Madras by Mr. G. W. Thellusson, in the season 1807-8. This appointment was likewise given to Mr. Woodford, and 3,000*l.* was received for it from Mrs. Gardiner, by Mr. Tahourdin for his own use, but upon an undertaking that he is to procure the next presentation of a living of the value of 300*l.* per annum for a friend of Mr. Woodford's. Mr. Boase, a partner in the house of Messrs. Ransom and Co. was privy to the bargain between Mr. Tahourdin and Mrs. Gardiner. Mr. Greenslade received an appointment for Ceylon in the way of exchange for this writership, which is the occasion of his name appearing in the transaction.

**CADETS.**—Mr. Henry Stoughton was appointed a Cadet to Madras, Jan. 1808, by George Abercrombie Robinson, esq. by the recommendation of Mr. Morland, who gave the appointment to Mr. Jones for a relation of his. Mr. Jones, through the agency of John Annesley Shee, sold it to Mr. Stoughton, father to the person appointed, from whom Shee received 500 guineas : he paid 180*l.* to Mr. Jones, and received of him an undertaking to pay 320*l.* upon his procuring for Mr. Jones a Woolwich Cadetship. This appointment has been vacated by the Court of Directors, in consequence of their having discovered the means through which it was obtained.

Mr. Thomas Kelly was appointed a Cadet to Bombay in April 1808, by sir Theophilus Metcalfe, bart. at the recommendation of Mrs. Scott. It was afterwards exchanged with Mr. Cotton, at his request, for a Madras Cadetship. Wm. Scott, tailor, the husband of Mrs. Scott, sold this appointment to Mr. Kelly, through the agency of David Brown, who received for it 150*l.* : Brown was paid 30*l.* or 40*l.* and a Mr. Southcomb, who introduced

some of the parties to each other, received 10 guineas.

Mr. George Barker was appointed Cadet for the Bengal Infantry in Dec. 1808, by Robert Thornton, esq. at the recommendation of Mr. Mee. Mr. Mee sold this appointment for 200 guineas, through the agency of John Annesley Shee, who received 60*l.*

Mr. George Teulon was appointed to an Infantry Cadetship to Bengal in 1808, by Edward Parry, esq. in exchange for a Madras appointment given to capt. Sealy by Jacob Bosanquet, esq. Capt. Matthew sold this appointment for 120*l.* to captain Holmes for a friend of his; Annesley M'Kercher Shee was employed as agent for captain Matthew, who paid him 30*l.* and capt. Holmes paid him 10*l.*

Mr. J. S. Williams was appointed to a Bengal Cadetship by Mr. Cotton in 1808, in exchange for a Madras Cadetship of Mr. Manship's. This appointment was procured by Mr. Abercrombie, who was assisted with the loan of a sum of money by capt. Williams, the Cadet's father. Mrs. Eliz. Morrison and A. M'K. Shee were the agents employed.

Mr. Benj. Pratt was appointed a Cadet to Madras 7th Feb. 1806, by Sweney Toone, esq. at the recommendation of capt. Kennard Smith, who exchanged it with R. C. Plowden, esq. for a nomination of the next season. Mr. B. Pratt was recommended to Mr. Plowden by sir Nicholas Nugent. This appointment was purchased by Mr. H. Foster, through sir Nich. Nugent, for the sum of 150*l.* A. M'K. Shee acted as agent for Mr. Foster, and received 30*l.* or 40*l.* The original appointment was to Bengal, and it was exchanged for Madras.

Mr. John Power was appointed a Cadet to Madras in 1804 or 1805 by lord viscount Castlereagh, at the recommendation of lord Longueville, through the earl of Westmoreland. Mr. Power paid 200*l.* for this appointment to M. S. Salt. A. M'K. Shee was the agent for both parties, and received 50*l.* from Mr. Power.

Mr. Brathwaite Christie was appointed a Cadet to Madras 15th July 1807, by James Reid, esq. at the recommendation of h. r. h. the d. of Clarence. Mr. Page, navy agent in Great Russell-street, paid the sum of 200*l.* for this appointment to A. M'K. Shee, who paid 150*l.* to the rev. Mr. Llloyd, chaplain to h. r. h. the d. of Clarence, for procuring the same.

Mr. Thomas Maw was appointed a Cadet to Bengal in July 1807, by Robert

Thornton, esq. at the recommendation of the rev. Nicholas Corsellis for Miss Eliz. Spinluff. Miss Spinluff sold this appointment to Mr. Hewitt, a relation of Mr. Maw, through the agency of Mrs. Morrison and A. M'K. Shee, and received 70*l.* for it. Mrs. Morrison thinks the sum paid was 150*l.* or 180*l.* A. M'K. Shee received 30*l.*

Mr. Arthur Denny was appointed a Cadet to Madras on the 18th Feb. 1806, by G. W. Thellusson, esq. at the recommendation of the countess dowager of Westmoreland and Mr. George. This appointment was sold by Mr. George. Mr. Anth. Stoughton, uncle of the person appointed, paid to J. A. Shee, whom he employed to procure it, the sum of 250 guineas. David Brown was agent for Mr. George.

Mr. Henry Keating was appointed a Cadet to Madras on the 5th of June 1805, by John Manship, esq. at the recommendation of G. W. Thellusson, esq. in return for a Bombay nomination of the season of 1804 given to Mr. Manship. The uncle of Mr. Henry Keating purchased this appointment of Mr. J. Henderson, ship-broker, for 250*l.* or guineas. J. A. Shee received of Mr. Henderson about 45*l.* for his agency.

Mr. George Boys was appointed a Cadet to Madras on the 26th March 1806 (of the season 1805) by Charles Mills, esq. at the recommendation of Mr. (now sir W.) Fraser. This appointment was given by sir W. Fraser to Mr. Tho. Cusac, who sold it to Messrs. Barber & Sons, Cowper's-court, Cornhill, and received of them the sum of 150*l.* They were employed as agents for Mr. Boys's father, who paid for it the sum of 300 guineas. 100*l.* was divided between Mr. Barber and Mr. John Henderson. J. A. Shee was agent for Mr. Cusac.

Mr. W. Collett was appointed a Cadet for the Bombay Infantry by the India Board, on the 3d of July 1805. This appointment was in the nomination of lord Castlereagh, who, at the recommendation of the right hon. John Sulivan, gave it to Richard Codman Etches, for a relation of his, on account of services performed by Mr. Etches for the government. Mr. Etches sold it to Mr. Chaplin, an attorney, for the sum of 250*l.* J. A. Shee was agent for Mr. Pasmore, an attorney, who received the money for Mr. Etches.

Mr. John Manson was appointed Cadet for Bengal the 26th Feb. 1808, by the India Board, at the recommendation of Edw.

Cooke, esq. Mr. C. Etches procured this appointment through Mr. Cooke, for a relation of his, on account of services performed by Mr. Etches for the government. Thomas Watson was employed as agent to sell the same, as mentioned in the next appointment.

Mr. Robert Manson was appointed Cadet for Bengal, Feb. 1808, by G. W. Thellusson, esq. at the recommendation of Mr. Herbert. Tho. Watson sold this appointment, and received the sum of 500 guineas of Messrs. Anderson, of Philpot-lane, for this and Mr. John Manson's appointment, who purchased the two for a friend of theirs for his two nephews. A. M'K. Shee received 35*l.* of Watson; and lady Leigh received from Watson about 200*l.* for the latter appointment.

Mr. Thomas Casey was appointed a Cadet by W. Devaynes, esq. on the 9th July 1806, at the recommendation of Mr. Herbert, now abroad as purser of the Euphrates extra ship. Mr. Herbert sold this appointment to Messrs. Henry Houghton & Co. of King's Arms Yard, correspondents of Mr. Casey's relations, who lived in Ireland, for the sum of 250 guineas; Mr. John Henderson was agent for Mr. Herbert, and received 50 guineas.

Mr. Thomas Locke was appointed a Cadet for Madras on the 3d Feb. 1807, by John Bebb, esq. at the recommendation of James Pattison, esq. in exchange for one of Mr. Pattison's Bombay nominations. This appointment was purchased by the rev. Dr. Locke of Farnham, for his nephew, of Thomas Watson, who sold it for lady Lunin, and paid her 200*l.*

Mr. Samuel Lewis was appointed a Cadet in 1800, by Sweney Toone, esq. at the recommendation of Mr. Evans. This appointment was passed from Mr. Evans to Mr. Sanderson: A. M'K. Shee seems to have procured it of Mr. Wright, and received 300 guineas from the Cadet's father. Mr. Sam. Lewis being a Mulatto, and thereby disqualified, procured a young man of the name of Phillips to personate himself and pass the previous examinations, for which he paid him 20 guineas.

A Cadetship for Madras appears to have been purchased for a person of the name of Brown, in 1804 or 1805, which was sold by Mr. Herbert for 250 guineas; but your Committee could receive no satisfactory information by whom the party was nominated, nor his Christian name. Henderson and Shee were employed as agents, and received part of the above sum.

A Cadetship in the nomination of J. Manship, esq. given by him to Mrs. Welch, appears to have been sold; but the parties to that transaction, who have been examined, state, that they are unable to recollect the name of the person appointed. The name of Mrs. Welch does not appear as recommending to any of Mr. Manship's Cadetships in 1805 or 6.

Another, in the nomination of sir Lionel Darell, appears to have been given to and sold by the rev. Thomas Lloyd; but Mr. Lloyd's name does not appear as recommending any of the Cadets nominated by sir L. Darell in 1801 and the following year.

It appears in evidence, that some other nominations of this description have been purchased: but your Committee have not been able to discover and bring before them some of the persons who appear to have been parties to these transactions; particularly sir Nich. Nugent, Mr. W. Lewen Tugwell Robins, Mr. Jos. Home, cap. Matthew and cap. Holmes. A further examination into some other bargains, is precluded by the death of lady Lunin, lady Leigh, and cap. Sealy.

The attention both of the Legislature and of the East India Company has been attracted at various periods to Abuses, which were supposed to exist in the disposal of their Patronage; in consequence of which, at the time when their charter was renewed, an oath was framed, to be taken by each Director within ten days after his election, containing, among other engagements, the following: "I do swear, That I will not directly nor indirectly accept or take any perquisite, emolument, fee, present or reward, upon any account whatsoever, or any promise or engagement for any perquisite, emolument, fee, present or reward whatsoever, for or in respect of the appointment or nomination of any person or persons to any place or office in the gift or appointment of the said Company, or of me as a Director thereof, or for or on account of stationing or appointing the voyage or voyages of any ship or ships in the said Company's employ, or for or on account of or any ways relating to any other business or affairs of the said Company." 33 Geo. 3. c. 52. s. 160.—In the By-laws of the East India Company, c. 6. sect. 5. a penalty is imposed upon every Director taking any reward on account of any appointment, in double the amount of such reward, two-thirds of which to the Company and one-third to the Informer; and such Director is rendered ipso-

sacto incapable of holding any place whatever under the Company.—The form of Declaration on every writer's Petition, is, “ I recommended this Petition, and do most solemnly declare that I have given this nomination to and that I neither have received myself, nor am to receive, nor has any other person, to the best of my knowledge or belief, received, nor is to receive, any pecuniary consideration, nor any thing convertible in any mode into a pecuniary benefit on this account.” The form of Certificate required to be signed by the nearest of kin to each Cadet, contains the following declaration : “ I do further declare, that I received the said appointment for my son

gratuitously, and that no money or other valuable consideration has been or is to be paid, either directly or indirectly, for the same ; and that I will not pay or cause to be paid, either by myself, by my son, or by the hands of any other person, any pecuniary or valuable consideration whatsoever, to any person or persons who have interested themselves in procuring the said nomination for my son from the Director above-mentioned.”—The printed preparatory Instructions, which are circulated by the East India Company for the use of those who may be nominated Cadets, begin with the following Resolution : “ That any person who shall in future be nominated to a situation, either civil or military, in the service of this Company, and who shall have obtained such nomination either directly or indirectly by purchase, or agreement to purchase through the medium of an agent or other person, shall be rejected ; and the person so nominated shall be rendered incapable of holding any situation whatsoever in the Company's service : and in the event of any person having obtained an appointment in the manner before stated, and proceeded to India previous to its being discovered, such person shall be dismissed the Company's service and ordered back to England, and shall also be rendered incapable of holding any situation whatsoever in the Company's service.” It is to be observed, that abuses in the disposal of Cadetships are better guarded against than in that of Writerships, since the present form of Certificate has been applied to them ; for in the Writerships the Director himself only declares, that to the best of his knowledge or belief no pecuniary consideration has been or is to be received ; but with regard to every Cadet, the parent or next of kin makes a similar

declaration for himself. The cases which are exhibited in this report demonstrate that such declarations are not of sufficient force to prevent a very extensive traffic in those nominations, which are apparently the best secured by a positive denial of all undue practices. An enquiry was set on foot by the Court of Directors in 1798 upon the allegation and suspicion of abuses in the nominations of Writers ; the origin, progress and failure of which it may be proper to give in some detail.—25 April 1798 : A Committee of the Directors was appointed to investigate into the truth of the alleged practice of the sale of Patronage, and to consider of such means as may appear likely to prevent the same in future, if such practices have occurred. 9th July : Each Director's nomination of Writers was laid before the Committee, who resolved that each Member of the Committee should state in writing the names of the parties to whom he has given the nomination, together with the reasons which induced him to give the same : and that the several parties who have received such nominations for their sons, &c., be required to produce satisfactory information to the Committee upon oath, or in such manner as the Committee shall deem most expedient, that neither they nor any person on their account, or with their privy or knowledge, have given or promised to give any consideration on account of such nomination, either to the Director from whom they obtained the same, or to any person on his behalf : and it was agreed to recommend to the Court to direct each individual Member of the Court to do the same. 1st August 1798 : The Court approved this Report ; and (15th August) each Director in office, as well as those out of by rotation (except Mr. Devaynes) gave explanations in writing.—28th Feb. 1799 : It was resolved, That every appointment made in consequence of corrupt practices be null and void, unless the parties to whom the appointment is given shall, upon examination before the Committee, make a fair and candid disclosure of all the circumstances attending the same. It was likewise resolved, that each Director should in future, on the Petition of the Writer whom he nominates, “ declare upon his honour to whom he has given the appointment, and that he neither has received himself, nor is he to receive, nor has any other person to the best of his knowledge or belief received, nor is to receive, any pecuniary consideration, nor any thing convertible in

"any mode into a pecuniary benefit on "this account." The Direction being changed in April; on the 14th of August 1799, a new Committee to investigate the truth of the sale of Patronage, &c. was appointed. 17 Jan. 1800: The draft of a Letter proposed to be addressed to the parents, &c. of persons appointed Writers since 1793, requesting them to declare whether the appointments were given without any pecuniary or other consideration, was considered by the committee; when a discussion arose, whether it should be on oath; when it was adjourned till the 21st of Jan.: and it being then suggested whether it would be proper for the Committee to proceed in their inquiry, it was decided in the affirmative.

The Committee then proceeded to consider the drafts of the letter to the parents, &c. a draft of a Report to the Court stating their reasons for recommending this mode of investigation, as also the form of a declaration for the persons who have received such appointments. The consideration was adjourned to the 24th of Jan.; when a discussion ensuing thereon, and on the necessity and expediency of the mode of public investigation therein proposed; it was agreed to postpone the said Report, and to proceed to act agreeably to the authority and instructions already received from the Court. The Committee resolved, that in their opinion the parties to whom each Director had given nominations, should be called upon to state on what grounds they have received the same, in every case that the Committee may deem it expedient so to do.

The Committee then examined, *viva voce*, its different members, as a preliminary to the proposed measure; each member declared upon his honour that what he had stated in regard to his appointments was strictly true, and expressed his readiness to confirm the same by his oath. —28th Jan. 1800: The Committee met to consider a draft of a Report to the Court, communicating their proceedings, and proposing further measures for the Court's adoption, as also a draft of a letter referred to in the said Report.—31st Jan.: The Report of this day's date, with the letters to the parents, &c. and the declaration to be made by them, was approved. —5th Feb.: The Court, after considerable discussion of the above, confirm the same; but resolve that the consideration of what is further to be done on the said Report be adjourned to the 11th of Feb.: when it is resolved, that the Committee of

Patronage be instructed to proceed in the examination of the other members of the Court, as they did with themselves. It was then moved, that the declaration proposed in the Report be upon oath: on this, the motion of adjournment was carried.—25th Feb.: A Report signed by 15 Directors, approves the Declaration, and recommends that the several persons to whom the same is sent be requested to confirm such declaration upon oath.—Another Report on the same day, signed by 12 Directors, recommends that no further proceedings be had in this business till the 1st of May. Both the above Reports are approved by the Court.—26th Feb. 1800. The right hon. Henry Dundas addressed the Court, acknowledging the receipt of their minute; and stating, that he feels it a duty that he owes both to himself and the Court, to omit no means in his power for ascertaining whether any person whom he has obliged through the favour of the Court, has presumed to abuse his kindness in so sordid and unwarrantable a manner.

Sir Francis Baring dissents from the Resolutions to call for the declaration on oath.

The Committee of Patronage ceasing with the Direction in April; on 18th June 1800, the Court took into consideration the propriety of re-appointing the said Committee.—It being moved, "That a Committee of Patronage be re-appointed;" an amendment was moved, to leave out all the words after the word "that," and to insert in their room the following, "it does not appear to this Court, that any circumstance has been stated to the Court, by which the Committee lately appointed for an inquiry into the disposal of Patronage, that can induce or would justify the Court in adopting the illegal and novel administration of extra-judicial oaths to a variety of persons, not directly connected with the East India Company or the management of its affairs, and which, though it would tend to throw a suspicion upon the Court at large, which no circumstances that have hitherto come to the knowledge of the Court can induce them to suppose the members thereof merit, would not, they conceive, be an effectual mode of bringing to light any such practices, even if such in any partial instance should have existed."

On the question for the Amendment being put, the votes for, and against, were

equal; when the lot decided for the Amendment.

25th June: The Chairman, Deputy Chairman and eight other Directors dissent from the Resolution not to re-appoint the Committee of Patronage. — 24th Sept.: A motion was made in the Court of Proprietors, that the above Proceedings be read; they were read accordingly, and notice given by the mover, of his intention of bringing the subject forward at a future Court.—20th Jan.: 1801, It was “moved, That it is the opinion of this Court, “that the Inquiry into the alleged abuse of “Patronage, ought to be continued.”—It was moved to amend the said motion, by adding thereto the following words, “to investigate any charge that may be “made of corrupt practices against any “one or more of the Court of Directors.” The above Amendment passed in the negative;—When a ballot was demanded on the original question; it was, 3d Feb.: 1801, lost by a majority of 139; 411 voting for the question, against it 550.

The following opinion of Counsel was given to the Court of Directors, previous to the ballot being taken; viz.

“Case for the East India Company:

“Whether the Court of Directors, or any Committee of the said Court, whether considered as a Committee of that Court, or as a Committee of Proprietors, be legally authorized to call for the examination of such persons upon oath, as recommended by the Court of Directors in their Resolution of the 25th Feb. 1800; or whether in their opinion any magistrate would be justified in administering the oath so recommended; and generally to advise concerning the legality, and effect of such proceedings.—We are of opinion, that neither the Court of Directors, nor any Committee of the said Court, or Committee of Proprietors, have any legal authority to require or receive examinations of persons upon oath, as recommended by the Resolution of the Court of Directors of the 25th Feb.: 1800; and that no magistrate will be justified in administering such oaths.—“We therefore think the proposed proceedings would be contrary to law.”—(Signed) J. Mitford, W. Grant, J. Mansfield, T. Erskine, George Rous.”

If this house should in its wisdom adopt any legislative measures for the purpose of preventing all traffic in the disposal of offices under government, it will, in the opinion of your Committee, be proper to extend the same protection to Patronage

held under the East India Company; but they see no reason to recommend any special or separate provisions as applicable to their case, judging that the East India Company has within its own power the most effectual means for accomplishing that end.—It can never be advisable, without absolute necessity, to add new offences to the long catalogue already enumerated in the penal statutes; nor is it wise to diminish the sanctity of oaths by resorting to them upon all occasions. Where solemn declarations have been habitually disregarded, little reliance can be placed upon the sanction of any other species of asseveration. Instances occur but too frequently, where an oath comes to be considered merely as part of the official form by which an appointment is conferred; and the human mind, fertile in self-deception, accommodates itself with wonderful facility to overcoming all scruples, or applies a perverse ingenuity to evading all restrictions which stand in the way of present interest. Little fear of detection is entertained, when transactions are in their nature private and confidential; and the appellation of honour, most improperly applied to negotiations of this clandestine kind, attaches, by a singular perverseness, a stronger degree of obligation to the performance of such engagements, upon the very ground that they are illegal.

With a view to prevent all dealings in Patronage, the obvious and natural mode will be to take away all inducement to traffic in it; and this can only be attained by making the hazard of such speculations greater than the temptation.—The regulations of the Company are founded upon this true and efficacious principle. But examples have hitherto been wanting to demonstrate the determination of the Court of Directors to enforce their orders; no instance of purchasing or procuring by undue means an appointment in the civil or military service of the East India Company, after such appointment had actually taken place, and since the Court’s Resolution of 28th Feb. 1799, having been so far established, as to enable the Court to dismiss the party appointed.—The immediate consequence of the information contained in this Report, must be, that a certain number of persons in the service of the Company will be instantly deprived of their employments, recalled from India, and declared incapable of again receiving any appointment under the Company. The money improperly given for procur-

ing these situations, will be absolutely lost, without any possibility of recovery; and those who have either imprudently or corruptly been concerned in obtaining what they conceived to be benefits for their relatives or friends, will find that they have done the greatest injury to those whom they desired to serve, by inducing them to dedicate some of the best years of their lives to an employment, which the original defects, and corrupt practices through which it was obtained, must disqualify them from prosecuting.—Hard as some of these cases must be, and innocent and ignorant as many of the young men nominated under these circumstances probably are, of the undue means by which their Appointments were acquired, your Committee are of opinion, that nothing but a strict adherence to the rule laid down by the Court of Directors, can put a stop to the continuance of these abuses, and prevent the chance of their recurring.—In 1779, when, in the course of the investigation already mentioned, indemnity was offered to all those who would make a fair and candid disclosure of all the circumstances through which their situations had been procured, though information was gained with regard to facts, no example could be made, in consequence of such disclosure, of those who were found offending; and it may be doubted whether such practices have been less prevalent since that inquiry, than before. The deficiency of their power to compel persons to answer, precluded the Court of Directors from discovering, if they punished, or from punishing if they discovered, the traffic which was the subject of complaint.

The oath taken by the Directors seems as effectual as any thing which can be devised for the purpose of guarding against corruption, so far as the Directors themselves are immediately concerned; and your Committee have already remarked, that no one case of corruption or abuse, which has been before them, affects any member of that Court. It is, in the passing through several hands, which happens frequently with regard to the more numerous and less valuable Appointments of Cadets, that opportunities for this sort of negotiation are presented, which, without a greater degree of vigilance and strictness on the part of each Director, at the time of making such nomination, it will be impracticable to prevent in future.

Your Committee may perhaps be exceeding the limits of their province, in the further considerations to which this subject leads; but as they decline recommending any special legislative enactment, their view of the proper remedy for these abuses may be incomplete, unless they proceed to suggest some other observations.—The unpleasant duty of increased vigilance is not likely to be performed without some incitement of benefit or disadvantage, attendant upon the exercise, or neglect of it; and it is equally conformable to experience to presume, that patronage will continue to be abused, so long as no inconvenience is felt by the person primarily giving, or by the person ultimately receiving it.—Where strict examination is a duty, any species of negligence cannot be wholly blameless; and it appears not unreasonable to curtail in some degree, the patronage of those, who have either not been sufficiently watchful in the disposal of it, or whose diligence has been unsuccessful in preventing the abuses which are complained of. As an additional check against those who are inclined to purchase such appointments, it may be expedient that a bond should be given by the parent, guardian, or friend of every person receiving a nomination, containing a penalty to be paid to the East India Company, upon proof being made at any subsequent period, that any valuable consideration was given for such appointment; that species of proof being deemed sufficient to levy the penalty, upon which the Court of Directors may think themselves authorized to vacate the appointment.

The practices which are developed in the present Report, and other transactions which this house has recently had under its cognizance, are sufficient to demonstrate, that patronage of various descriptions has, in several instances, become an article of traffic; that an opinion of the generality of such practices has been prevalent to a still greater extent; and that fraudulent agents have availed themselves of this belief, to the injury of the credulous and unwary, and to the discredit of those in whose hands the disposition of offices is lodged. It will depend upon the steps which may be taken in consequence of these Inquiries, whether such abuses shall receive a permanent check, or a virtual encouragement.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 18.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 6, 1809.

[Price 1s.

ENGLISHMEN, bear in everlasting remembrance, the Cases of HAMLIN, the Tinman, and of LORD CASTLEREAGH, the Privy Counsellor, Secretary of State, and Member of Parliament; and, unless you *clearly shew* to the world, that you feel as you ought, as to the decision upon those cases, a curse ought to stick to you and to your children, from generation to generation.

673]

[674

TO  
THE INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

LETTER I.

*Lord Castlereagh and Philip Hamlin.*

GENTLEMEN,

When, at our last County-Meeting, an objection was made to our introducing into our Resolution the affair of Lord Clancarty and Lord Castlereagh, you had the good sense to over-rule that objection, though made by sir Henry Mildmay, whom you were ready to thank for having done his duty, but, by whom you were not to be induced to resign the exercise of your rights and the use of your reason. Nor, can I refrain from observing here, that we, who have no party or selfish purpose to serve, must, if we mean to profit from the victory we have obtained, be very cautious how we give way to any thing like *thick-and-thin* support of any body. Sir Henry Mildmay did well in voting for Mr. Warde amongst the 125; but, that is only one act; it is merely a single act; and is by no means sufficient to induce us to continue our praise of that gentleman, unless we find him steady in his endeavours to serve the country, and especially in his endeavours to rescue the nation from the degraded state in which it has long been. I do not wish to excite any suspicions with respect to this gentleman; but merely to settle this point: namely, that, for the good he *has done* we have given him our thanks, in terms the most handsome; but, that, we are not, for this reason, at all bound to praise him in future, and are perfectly free to express our real sentiments, be they what they may, as to his future conduct, and, of course, to *act* upon those sentiments. No, Gentlemen, let us keep ourselves free from all thick-and-thin engagements and attachmants; let each of us exercise his own judgment; let each of us for himself make due inquiry, and act upon the decision of his own mind; let us not be persuaded or coaxed to do that which our own reason tells us is not right; let us form and preserve an attachment to

principles and not to men; above all, let us despise the watch-words of party; let us thus act, and you will soon see, that this county, in spite of all the dreadful influence of the Dockyards, the Barracks, and the Custom-House, will not only recover its independence, but will set an example to other counties. The reason why your voice has heretofore not been heard, is this; that you had no inclination to attend at county-meetings. The few who did attend saw that the object was merely a party one; that no good purpose was answered by an attendance; that a set of Resolutions, ready cut and dry, were passed without opposition; that the audience consisted, upon one occasion, of the slaves of men in power, and, upon the next occasion, of the slaves of men who wanted to get into power; that, in fact, you were only to give your voice for what one party or the other party sent down from London to be passed, and to be sent back again as being the *decision of the county of Hants*, when it was no more the decision of the real people of the county, than it was the decision of the inhabitants of the moon. No wonder that such meetings had fallen into contempt. The tradesmen and yeomen of the county despised the imposture; and it did not occur to them to take the trouble of exposing it. Recent events, quite sufficient for the purpose, indeed, have roused us. They have brought us together from all parts of the county; made us acquainted with one another; produced an interchange of friendship; and do very fairly promise to make us formidable to any man, or set of men, who shall dare attempt again to consider us as men of straw. Far be it from me to inculcate feelings of disrespect towards rank, family, or learned professions; but, one cannot shut one's eyes to glaring truths, and, it was impossible for any one not to perceive, on the 25th of April last, that the "*great men*" of the county did not appear to be much better able than we were to conduct the business which had called us together; and, to say the plain

Y

truth, not quite so able. To myself I take no merit on account of that day's proceedings; for, though I have been much more accustomed to writing than most of you have, and though I necessarily possess more knowledge, upon political subjects, than the greater part of you can have had leisure to acquire, still I am of opinion, that, out of the two thousand of you, who were present, there were at least one hundred full as able to state your rights to the meeting as I was. You, *all of you*, possess sufficient knowledge; and you want only the confidence to do it. This was the *third* county-meeting that I had ever been at, and it was the *sixth* time that I ever attempted to speak to a public assembly. No one could do it with greater reluctance; but, it being the duty of some one to assert our rights, and I, seeing no other person disposed to get the better of that reluctance which was common to us all, resolved to do it myself, and, in this respect, to set you an example. I knew that the county had sense and spirit, and I was determined to give them a fair chance of displaying themselves; and, to your honour, display themselves they did.— Some of the hireling writers, in London, frantic at the result of our meeting, have absented me without measure, and have expressed their utter astonishment, that the "*noblemen and gentlemen*" of the county should suffer you to be *led* by a person like me. Now, in the first place, you were *not led* by me. You assembled without my asking a soul of you to attend. Forty-nine out of every fifty of you were perfect strangers to me; and, I am sincerely convinced, that not a man of you would have voted for the Resolution that I proposed, if you had not approved of it in your own mind. And, in the next place, "*the noblemen and gentlemen*" of the county have no such power over you as these hireling London-writers seem to suppose they have. You stand in no need of their support or assistance, or good-offices, in any way whatever. They come, indeed, at every *cantussing* season, and give you a hypocritical smile, and a squeeze of the hand; but this they do to the vilest knave in the county, who has a freehold of forty shillings a year, and whose family, perhaps, you have to maintain out of the poor-rates, while he maintains himself in idleness and drink by depredations upon your property of various descriptions. Besides, there is this wide difference between me and those "*noblemen and gentlemen*," of whom these writers speak: long

experience has convinced you, that they have always some selfish object in view; that they wish you to give them your support, in order that they, by the use they make of the power you put in their hands, may get something for themselves or their families. This you know well; whereas, you are all convinced, that I have no such views; that I do not want, and will not have, any thing from the public; and, therefore, you expect, and meet with, from me, plain dealing; that which is for the good of us all, without respect to persons or party. But, at any rate, our abusers are in a very pinching dilemma with respect to me and you; for, they must agree to one of two things; namely, either that *I am a person of very great consequence in the county*; or, that the Resolution which *I* proposed and you adopted contained the genuine expression of your minds. I know that the latter is the truth; but, let those who would fain vilify me and my principles, hitch themselves upon whichever horn of the dilemma they may feel to be the least galling.

I shall now address you, though it need not be at much length, upon the subject of Lord CASTLEREAGH's conduct, which subject made part of the Resolution, passed at the meeting.—Sir Henry Mildmay requested us to stop, '*till that matter had received the decision of the House of Commons*'. But, as we had before us, a Copy of the whole of the Evidence in the case, printed by order of the House of Commons itself, we thought it not at all necessary to wait for that decision, supposing ourselves to be full as able as that House to decide upon a plain matter of fact; especially as we simply declared what was contained in the evidence itself, and contrasted the conduct of this Lord with the principles of the constitution, as contained in the BILL OF RIGHTS, which is one of our great constitutional laws.—On the same day, that we passed our Resolution, the House of Commons discussed, and decided upon, the conduct of Lord Castlereagh; and I beg leave to state to you what was done by the House upon that occasion.—The business was brought forward by LORD ARCHIBALD HAMILTON, who concluded his speech with moving the following Resolutions:—

"I. That it appears to the House, from the evidence on the table, that Lord Viscount Castlereagh, in the year 1805, shortly after he had quitted the situation of President of the Board of Control, and being a Privy Counsellor and Secretary of

" State, did place at the disposal of Lord Clancarty, a Member of the same Board, the nomination to a Writership, in order to facilitate his procuring a Seat in Parliament.—II. That it was owing to a disagreement among the subordinate parties, that this transaction did not take effect; and—III. That by this conduct Lord Castlereagh had been guilty of a gross violation of his duty as a Servant of the Crown; an abuse of his patronage as President of the Board of Control: and an attack upon the purity of that House."—In opposition to these Resolutions, a LORD BINNING, one of the friends of the ministers, moved the *Order of the Day*; that is to say, to drop the matter, without any further inquiry or discussion; or, in other words, to decide, that it was a matter not of importance enough to occupy the attention of the House of Commons! Most of the members, however, did think that it was a little too bad; and that some little notice, some little censure, ought to be pronounced.—The question was taken upon Lord Archibald Hamilton's Resolutions, and it was negatived, there being 167 for it, and 216 against it. So, you see, it was determined by the Honourable House, that this act on the part of one of its members, was not "an attack upon its PURITY;" in the justice of which determination I most heartily join.—Bravo! Well done Honourable House! " If this does not satisfy the country," as Mr. Fuller said, " I don't know what the devil will satisfy it."—Well, but what did the House agree to? Why to this:—" Resolved, That it is the duty of this House to maintain a jealous guard over the purity of election; but considering that the attempt of Lord Viscount Castlereagh to interfere in the election of a Member has not been successful, this House does not consider it necessary to enter into any criminal proceedings against him."—Englishmen, this, this, this was what the Honourable House agreed to. They came to a Resolution, that, because Lord Castlereagh's attempt HAD NOT BEEN SUCCESSFUL, it was unnecessary to enter into any criminal proceedings against him."—Now, then, let us see what was done in the case of PHILIP HAMLIN, the Tinman of Plymouth, who offered a bribe to Mr. ADDINGTON, when the latter was minister.—The case was this: In the year 1802, PHILIP HAMLIN, a Tinman of Plymouth, wrote a letter to MR. HENRY ADDINGTON, the first Lord of the Treasury and Chanc-

cellor of the Exchequer, offering him the sum of £. 2,000 to give him, HAMLIN, the place of Land-Surveyor of the Customs at Plymouth.—In consequence of this, a criminal information was filed, against the said HAMLIN, by Mr. Spencer Perceval, who was then the King's Attorney-General, and who, in pleading against the offender, asserted the distinguished purity of persons in power, in the present day. From the Bench great stress was laid on the gravity of the offence of *tendering a bribe*; of the baneful tendency of such crimes, in a moral as well as in a political point of view. The Tinman was found guilty; he was sentenced to pay a fine of 100 pounds to the King, and to be imprisoned for three months. His business was ruined; and he himself died, in a few months after his release from prison.—Hamlin confessed his guilt; he stated, in his affidavit, " that he sincerely repented of his crime; that he was 40 years of age; that his business was the sole means of supporting himself and family; that a severe judgment might be the total ruin of himself and that family; and that therefore, he threw himself upon, and implored, the mercy of his prosecutors and of the Court."—In reference to this, Mr. Perceval, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, observe, said: " The circumstances which the defendant discloses, respecting his own situation in life, and of his family are all of them topics, very well adapted to affect the private feelings of individuals, and, as far as that consideration goes, nothing further need be said; but, there would have been no prosecution at all, in this case, upon the ground of personal feeling; it was set on foot upon grounds of a public nature, and the spirit in which the prosecution originated, still remains; it is, therefore, submitted to your lordships, not on a point of individual feeling, but of PUBLIC JUSTICE, in which case your lordships will consider how far the affidavits ought to operate in mitigation of punishment."—The Judge, Mr. Justice Gros, in passing sentence upon this poor, pettish, ignorant offender, said: " Such a practice, if permitted, would lead to mischief in calculable; for it might extend to every office in the appointment of the great ministers of the state, civil, military, and ecclesiastical, and would supersede men of ability and integrity, and place, in their stead, the ignorant and corrupt."—Now, people of Hampshire; now, English-

men, who have been taught so highly to prize impartial justice, compare the decisions in these two cases; bear them in remembrance; and let them have a proper weight upon your conduct on all future occasions.—Hamlin's attempt, observe, was not successful, any more than that of Lord Castlereagh!—There needs no more than to state these facts to you. Your own minds will furnish an appropriate commentary.—Justice as well as future utility require that we should have upon record the names of those who spoke for, and against Lord Archibald Hamilton's motion. *For it*, the speakers were, Lord Archibald, Hamilton, Mr. C. W. Wynn, Lord Milton, Mr. W. Smith, Mr. Grattan, Mr. Ponsonby, Sir Francis Burdett, Mr. Whitbread, and Mr. Tierney.—*Against it*, Lord Castlereagh himself, Lord Binning, Mr. Croker, MR. PERCEVAL (who prosecuted Hamlin), Mr. Fawkes, Mr. George Johnstone, Mr. H. Lascelles, Mr. Windham, and Mr. Canning.

You will perceive, Gentlemen, that I mean to address a series of Letters to you; and the mode I intend to pursue is this. On every Friday, when I have a letter to you ready for publication in my paper of the next day, I shall send by post, copies of such letter, time enough for its insertion in the Salisbury Journal, the Portsmouth Telegraph, the Hampshire Chronicle, and the Reading Mercury, of that same week. If you set a value upon these letters, you will, of course, continue to have that paper which shall insert them regularly. I hope, and believe, that all the papers, which circulate in the county, will insert them, the editors appearing to me to be men of sound principles; but, if some of them should insert them, and some not, then those persons who set a value upon the Letters will, of course, take a paper that does insert them. If, contrary to my hopes and expectations, none of these provincial papers should insert them, then, I trust, that those amongst you, who take my Register, will lend it as widely as possible through their respective neighbourhoods. But, Gentlemen, if this could possibly be the case; if the influence of those, who are sucking away our very blood, could be so great as to obstruct the circulation of political truth in the county, through the accustomed channels; then we would show them, that we were not to be so baffled, and that we would soon have a provincial paper that should circulate such truths. All that I want to see circulated

is truth. No falsehood; no calumny; nothing of personal spite. "Truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," without respect to persons, or to selfish interests; but this truth we will have circulated amongst us, in defiance of all that can be done by force or by fraud.—The editors of the provincial papers must acknowledge, that my proceeding is very fair; I shall write these letters for their papers as well as for my own; they will appear, if those editors choose, in their papers on the *Sunday*, and, in mine, they cannot reach any part of the county before that day. Copies of this Letter, for instance, will reach them all on *Friday* next, leaving them plenty of time to prepare it for the press. So that, if they all should, by the enemies of the county and the kingdom, be prevailed upon to endeavour to keep these Letters from your sight, they will have no reason to complain in case we resort to the establishment of a paper, which must be injurious to them.

I am, Your faithful friend,  
WM. COBBETT.

Botley, 2 May, 1809.

P. S. Once more I beg leave in this particular manner, to request those gentlemen, who take the Register, and who approve of its contents, to lend it for the perusal of those of their neighbours who do not find it convenient to take it themselves. Every man, who reads useful truths, is a man made the better for that reading. The pulpit, which, some years ago, made the churches resound with politics, is now as silent as the grave upon political subjects. Smother! smother! smother! is the order of the day. To the *Press* we must now look; and to make the press really useful, those must now read, who did not read before.—Upon looking again over the *Resolutions* proposed by Mr. Powlett, I perceive, that, owing to an error in copying them, the three which stand first, should have stood last. This is very material; because, by the transposition, thanks to Mr. Wardle is made but a secondary and inferior object, and a deeper dye of party is given to the whole. In justice, therefore, to Mr. Powlett, who, on so many accounts, is entitled to the respect of the county, I lose no time in correcting this error.

I had nearly forgotten one very material fact.—You remember, Gentlemen, when you called out: "Why is not Mr. CHUTE here to-day?" The answer was, that he was attending his duty in parliament.

—Well, then, gentlemen, if he was in the House of Commons on that day, he voted for Lord Castlereagh; for his name is not in the list of the minority upon that question; neither is the name of his worthy colleague, Mr. HEATHCOTE, in that list; so that, either they were not attending their duty in parliament, or they were both voting in direct opposition to the opinions of the county, that day expressed.

#### SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

LORD FOLKESTONE'S MOTION (concluded from page 620).—This, as will be seen by a reference to the page here pointed out, was a Motion for the appointing of a Committee to make further inquiry into the corrupt disposal of offices, &c. And, it will be remembered, that it was opposed upon the ground of its being *too general*; *too sweeping*; *too widely wasting*. — I shall now insert what Mr. Canning is reported to have said upon that occasion, having, at the place referred to, taken sufficient notice of all the other parts of the debate.—After repeating what others had said about the difference between specific inquiries and general inquiries, Mr. Canning concluded thus: “ He could not conceive for what rational or practicable purpose, this motion was brought forward. Was there no mischief in *keeping a persuasion alive in the public mind*, that it was the opinion of impartial men in that House, that *so much rottenness* and *corruption* existed in every part of the state, as rendered such an inquiry necessary? The motion held out no hope of immediate advantage to the people; but it held out the whole cast and class of public men to suspicion. They were all represented as eagerly struggling for places and power, and as *having nothing in view but the emoluments of office*. The emoluments of office! If there be any man who considered the labours of an official situation, the duties that were to be performed, the *anxieties* that were undergone, the warfare which a public man had to support, not only in that House, but from the malignity which assailed him *out of it*, and could think that these things were to be compensated by money, he did not envy such a man his feelings or frame of mind. If there was any man who could think so, it was to him a subject not of regret, but of pride, to be the object of the suspicion of such a man. The Noble Lord and his abet-

“ tors might succeed in fixing this imputation on all public men, and driving them from power; in rendering them a degraded class, that he and those who support him might succeed to that ruin and degradation. He could not agree to this WIDE-WASTING motion, without admitting the truth of assertions, for which he was persuaded there was no foundation.”—Bless us! What a taking the gentleman appears to have been in! But, Reader; honest Reader, do you not remember, that this gentleman and all the rest of them *hailed inquiry*; *rejoiced at inquiry*; were *glad* to their very souls that inquiry, *public inquiry*, inquiry the most extensive, had, by Mr. Wardle, been *at last* (as if they had been longing for it), brought forward in a “ *tangible shape!*” They seemed, then, as if they had had a month’s mind for inquiry. Of course, Lord Folkestone expected, that they must be glad again at seeing another, and still more extensive, inquiry moved for; but, “ no, thank you.” They seem to think they have had enough for this time; and, therefore, if it is all the same to his lordship, they beg leave to decline any more, at present, of the *joyous* entertainment.—So, Mr. Canning, there is a *ferment* in the public mind, is there? Now, if it be so, *how came* it there? Has it grown out of empty words; out of the declamation of speakers and writers; or out of the damning facts, revealed at the bar of the House of Commons, and out of the well-known decisions upon those facts?—There is a general persuasion, is there, “ that rottenness prevails in every part of the state?” Well, whose fault is that? But, this persuasion, which you allow to exist, is either *true* or *false*. Now, mind, the persuasion you do allow to exist, and you must allow it to be founded either in *truth* or *falshood*. If the former, surely an inquiry, detection, and appropriate punishment are necessary; and, if the latter, is not inquiry necessary, in order to shew the nation that it has been deceived?—There is no getting out of this, Sir.—You say, that there is *no ground* for the persuasion, that you allow to exist; well, then, my good Sir, why be in such a passion about it, and why not let this headstrong young Lord have his committee of inquiry, which, possibly, might keep him from other “ *mischief?*”—Sir, Sir, the case is too plain; the case is so very plain, that there needs nothing to be done, either “ *out of doors*” or *ir-doors*, but merely to state the *facts* belonging to it.—Why,

Sir, as to all of you, on both sides, being “represented” as being “eagerly struggling for places and power;” I really do not think it necessary to say any thing but this: that, if the representation be not true, I am greatly afraid, that a very ugly imputation must be taken to yourselves; for, I put it to yourself, Sir, whether both parties have not, a thousand and a thousand times over, preferred this charge against one another; a question which, I am sure, you must answer in the affirmative.—No, Sir, there is no one but a fool or a rogue, who is so unjust as to accuse any of you of “having nothing in view but the emoluments of office;” for, seeming to bear in mind the maxim of ST. PAUL, that it is being worse than a heathen to neglect one’s own kindred, most of the public men of our day, with filial and paternal and conjugal tenderness, take care to make pretty decent provision for their mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, wives, children, and other relations; there being from the maxim of the Apostle only this trifling deviation, that he seems to have meant such provision to have proceeded from a man’s own private means, while the provision we have here been speaking of proceeds from the means of the public, and those means, too, of which members of the House of Commons are, by the constitution, considered as the stewards.

—Now, Sir, as to the “warfare,” which you have to “support,” in the House, I have first to complain, that you did not make honourable and grateful mention of me, when you were complaining of the toils and dangers of that warfare; for, has it not been a subject of constant complaint with me, that there were regular fights carried on in the House; grand pitched battles, upon days fixed on for the purpose long before-hand? . Have I not been constantly lamenting the existence of a drilled and disciplined and embodied Opposition? Have I not a thousand times expressed my earnest wish to relieve the king’s servants from this warfare by keeping them out of the House, upon the principles of the Act of Settlement? Have I not said again and again, that it is impossible for men, who sit up debating till two or three o’clock in the morning, to attend properly to the management of great state-affairs?

—As to the “malignity,” with which you are assailed out of the House, lord Folkestone offered you a remedy for it; a complete remedy; inquiry, proof of innocence, and publicity of that proof. Why not print it, Sir? Print it, Sir;

“Print it, and shame the rogues?”—No, Sir, the noble Lord will not “succeed” in driving all public men from power, by which you must have meant all the present holders of, and candidates for, power and place; these his lordship will no more drive from power, than the Wellesleys will, I fear, drive the French out of Spain; or than the Archduke Charles will drive the Duke of Dantwick out of Germany. — Before I dismiss this article, I cannot refrain from noticing one observation in the speech of Mr. Perceval (see page 613), namely, “that it was not the punishment of past offences, which we should so ardently seek, as remedies and preventives of such abuses.”—Good; but, how came we to hear nothing of this, Sir, when you prosecuted HAMLIN, the Tinman of Plymouth, who had seen hundreds and thousands of advertisements of places under government for sale, and who was so ignorant a man, that when the warrant went down for apprehending him, he took it to be the patent for his place? How came we to hear nothing of this doctrine then, Sir, when you demanded his punishment in the name of PUBLIC JUSTICE, and when the judge pronounced sentence upon him for the sake of example?—It is very true, that our great object ought to be, the preventing of future crimes; but, Sir, this object is not to be attained by the suffering of past crimes to go unpunished; for, if this were the case, what justice is there in punishing sheep-stealing, or even murder? What would be said of a judge, who, when a man should be arraigned for burglary, were to say: “It is not the punishment of past offences that we ought so ardently to seek, as the prevention of future offences; and, therefore, we will not punish this man, nor will we even expose him to a trial?” What would be said of such a judge, Sir?—The public will answer this question for you, Sir; nor will they fail to come to a just decision upon the whole of the matter relating to the rejected motion of Lord Folkestone.—I trust, too, that that motion will produce full as good a national effect as if it had been carried, and as if the full inquiry had taken place. I trust, that the reasoning, which must, as to this matter, pass in the public mind, will supply the place of the searching object of the motion itself; I trust, that the conclusions which will, and which must be drawn, in the mind of every man of sense, will receive an impression so deep as never to be effaced; and I trust, that

we, by our fire-sides, shall frequently remind each other—That, on the 17th of April, 1809, Lord Viscount Folkestone moved, in the House of Commons, “that a Committee be appointed to inquire into “the existence of the corrupt disposal of “offices in the state; of the disposal of Com-“missions in the army *contrary to the re-“gulations*; and also into the practices rela-“ting to levies;” that the said motion was REJECTED, there being only 30 mem-“bers for it, and 178 against it; and that the persons who voted for it were these:

Lord Ossulstone	Samuel Whitbread, esq.
Lord Viscount Forbes	Lord Archibald Hamilton
Sir Wm. Lemon, bart.	C. C. Western, esq.
Sir T. Miller, bart.	H. Tracey, esq.
Sir John St. Aubyn, bart.	T. W. Coke, esq.
George Hibbert, esq.	Joseph Halsey, esq.
George Knapp, esq.	H. C. Combe, esq.
Thomas Foley, esq.	John Calcraft, esq.
J. Scudamore, esq.	Hon. C. Bradshaw
T. J. Symmonds, esq.	Lee Antonie, esq.
Thomas Creevey, esq.	Hon. W. Lamb
Lord Althorpe	Hon. W. Lyttleton
Wm. Ord, esq.	J. M. Lloyd
Hon. C. Pelham	TELLERS.
D. North, esq.	Lord Folkestone
Henry Parnell, esq.	Hon. C. Hutchinson.
G. L. Wardle, esq.	

These are precious facts. They should be the subject of conversation in all families. Every man, who is well acquainted with them, should make it a point to see that twenty other men are made to understand the matter clearly. There needs no eloquence; no garnish of style to set off such facts. A man, who has facts like these to detail, can be under no temptation either to write or to speak any thing that can, by the utmost stretch of legal ingenuity and chicane, be tortured into a libel. Plain matter of fact is all that the nation wants; and of that, as far as my circulation extends, it shall have a plentiful supply.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.—On Monday, the 1st of this month, there was held, at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, in the Strand, London, a Meeting of “THE FRIENDS OF PARLIAMENTARY REFORM,” at which meeting SIR FRANCIS BURDETT presided.—The assemblage was very numerous, not less than from eleven to twelve hundred people dining upon the occasion; and, what is of still more importance to notice, thousands being assembled in the streets near the Tavern, without any expectation of seeing a gaudy show, or any thing merely calculated to please the eye. It was not to see Sir Francis Burdett, for every soul in London had seen him before. In part it might be to see MR. WARDLE; but, then, it was the *principles*, which had

made his person an object of curiosity. In short, I think, this unusual anxiety; these very rare marks of public interest, cannot be ascribed to any thing but the well-known cause of the meeting, and an earnest wish for the success of that cause.—It would be quite impossible for me to give, in my limited space, any thing like an analysis of the speeches at this meeting. I will, therefore, first insert the RESOLUTIONS that were passed; and will then make a few of those remarks, which I think the most likely to be useful.—

“ At a Meeting of the Friends of such a Reform as would secure to the People the reality and uses of REPRESENTATION in PARLIAMENT, held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, Strand, London, on Monday, 1st May, 1809.

“ Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, Bart. M.P. in the Chair.—It was Resolved,

1. “ That it is the grand principle of the Constitution, that the People shall have a share in the government, by a just representation in Parliament.

2. “ That the long duration of Parliaments greatly facilitates the corruption of the Members, and removes that wholesome check or controul on their conduct, a frequent recurrence to the opinions of their Constituents.

3. “ That in a Petition presented to the House of Commons on the 6th May 1793, it was offered to be proved at the Bar, ‘ that 154 individuals did, by their own authority, appoint or procure the return of 307 Members of that House,’ (exclusive of those from Scotland), ‘ who were thus enabled to decide all questions in the name of the whole people of Great Britain.’

4. “ That this Meeting believes individual patronage in Boroughs has increased since 1793;—that in those in which the voters are few, and which are called OPEN, the returns are for the most part obtained for money;—that the Representation for Scotland is extremely influenced;—and that there are great defects in that of Ireland: and it is the opinion of this Meeting, that a great majority of the Members of the Commons House are so returned that the nation is not constitutionally represented; though it is taxed to support an expenditure of seventy millions sterling a year.

5. “ That in the Act (commonly called the Act of Settlement) which placed the House of Brunswick on the Throne

“ of these Realms, it was asserted and recognised as the Constitutional principle, “ That no person who has an Office or Place of Profit under the King, or receives a Pension from the Crown, shall be capable of serving as a Member of the House of Commons.”

6. “ That it appears by a Report laid on the table of the House of Commons in June last, that 78 of its Members are in the regular receipt under the Crown of 178,994*l.* a-year.

7. “ That in 1782, it was declared by Mr. Pitt in the House of Commons, that seven or eight Members of that House were sent there by the Nabob of Arcot, and that a foreign State in enmity to this country might procure a party to act for it under the mask and character of Members of that House.”

8. “ That such a state of representation is a national grievance.

9. “ That in every department of the State into which inquiry has been made, scandalous corruptions and abuses have been detected.

10. “ That the exclusion of the public voice from all influence in, and the consequent corruption of, the Governments of the Continental States, have been the causes of their subjugation.

11. “ That so long as the People shall not be fairly represented, corruption will increase; our debts and taxes will accumulate; our resources will be dissipated; the native energy of the people will be depressed; and the country deprived of its best defence against foreign foes.

12. “ That to remedy the great and glaring evils of which we complain, it is not necessary to have recourse to theoretical speculations, or dangerous experiments in Government, but to recur to the principles handed down to us by the wisdom and virtue of our forefathers.

13. “ That the remedy is to be found, and to be found only, in a full and fair Representation of the People in the Commons House of Parliament; a remedy equally necessary to the safety of the Throne, and the happiness and independence of the country.

14. “ That we therefore recommend to every Town, City, and County, to take the state of the Representation into consideration, and urgently, but temperately, to apply to Parliament to adopt such measures as shall secure to the Nation the reality and uses of Representation.

“ FRANCIS BURDETT, Chairman.”

Upon the Resolutions themselves, being nothing more or less than a chain of undeniable and notorious truths, I will offer only this observation; that, without any view of pertinacity of opinion, I think petitions to the king the most natural mode of proceeding; because, the cause is not less the cause of His Majesty than of his people, and because it appears to me not natural to call upon an assembly to purge itself. MR. STUART, of the Courier, whom I respect for his manly conduct during the recent enquiry, has asked me, whether I wish the king to do, as CROMWELL did, go to the House and turn the members out. This is very well as a jest; but, in sober earnest it is very foolish. No, Mr. Stuart knows, that I wish for no such thing. I wish His Majesty to recommend, in a speech to the Parliament, in like manner as he recommends other measures to them, an act, or acts, to reform the House of Commons agreeably to the constitution of the kingdom; and, I prefer this mode, because then the king would *take the lead* in the effecting of an object so dear to the hearts of his people; and, I am the more disposed to this, because I have heard, and that, too, from very good authority, that the king has, at various times, *expressed his perfect readiness to see such a reform take place.*—But, after all, there is not perhaps, much in the mere mode of making the application. The main thing is the set of *principles*, upon which we act; and, as we are all agreed as to them, there can be no difference of any consequence, in other respects.—The speech of Sir Francis Burdett was the very best I have ever read. The *whole* was good. I see not one word that I would wish to have left out. Full of sound constitutional principles, most aptly applied and ably illustrated.—MR. STUART of the Courier calls the assembly “ BURDETT-“ITES,” which name, as a catch-word, he seems disposed to apply to all the friends of Parliamentary Reform. He formerly called us “ Jacobins;” but of that he is, especially since the disclosures relating to John Bowles, Dr. O’Meara, and Mr. Beazley (all famous Anti-Jacobins) now ashamed. But, what does he mean, by this catch word? Does he mean, that Sir Francis Burdett meditates a *destruction of the monarchy?* And does he think, that any man in the kingdom will now believe this? Besides, was not Lord Cochrane one of this assembly, and did he not go as far as any one in support of the principles, upon which the assembly was acting? Was

not *Mr. Wardle* there, too, he, who has received and is receiving the praise of the whole nation, and of no one more warmly than of *Mr. Stuart*? Are *Major Cartwright* and *Mr. Maddocks* men to entertain views hostile to the settled order of law and property? Or are these gentlemen, and hundreds of other men of large property, who were present, such fools as not to perceive the drift of that *cunning, crafty* person, *Sir Francis Burdett*?—But, the COURIER allows, that a reform of the House of Commons is a very *desirable* thing, and a thing which the editor wishes to see brought about; but, he suggests, that a *time of war* is not the *proper time*. The truth is, that the time has always been found improper by those who wished it never to take place, and who had not boldness enough to deny the necessity of it. Let us examine, then, into the validity of this objection in point of time.—If to reform the House of Commons was one of those measures or enterprizes, which would necessarily draw off *any* portion, however small, of the resources of the kingdom, either in men or in money, then I should say, that the objection might be valid; because, in *time of war*, these are wanted for the purposes of national defence. The purchasing of so many buildings and pulling them down, in order to beautify the environs of the House of Commons in *time of war*, might, upon this ground, have been objected to, though it never was. Many other things of the same sort, or something similar at least, might be mentioned. If the reform of the parliament required any maritime enterprise to accompany it, then a *time of war* might be a bad time. But no resources either of men or of money does this measure demand; and, as far as I am able to discover, not the smallest obstructions to the operations of war could it possibly produce. “*The attention of the government.*” But, why should it engross the attention of the king’s ministers? Not to mention, that their *whole* time, for many *many* months past, has been engrossed by endeavours to defend those acts, which have proceeded solely from a want of such reform. Besides: for all great and important improvements, there is nothing like a *time of public danger*. It is precisely then that men are awake to the necessity of doing that, which, in times of no danger or embarrassment, they are too listless to attempt. It is when we most acutely feel the pain, that we have the courage to apply the remedy, and not in our intervals of comparative ease. We have, moreover,

the experience of our own country to sanction us. The Unions with Scotland and with Ireland were both effected in time of war; and, I remember, that, in the latter case, Lord Auckland *congratulated* the country upon the measure being undertaken in times of war, of difficulty, and of danger. And, if we believe, as we do believe, and as *Mr. Stuart* admits, that the principle of Parliamentary Reform is wise and just, and, of course, that the measure will be gratifying to the people, what, let me ask, would so forcibly tend to make the people patient under the heavy pressure created by the war, and to induce them to shed their blood in their country’s defence? There is no prospect, at present, of a safe termination to this war. *Mr. Fox* observed, that our measures should be calculated for twenty years duration of hostilities; though, poor man, he was dissuaded from the adoption of any such measures. When we look at the state of Europe; when we consider the age of Napoleon; when we view his character, his evident intentions, and the means he has to work with; when we take this survey, is it possible for us not to see the absolute necessity of placing our affairs at home upon *a permanent and solid footing*; and, I ask any man of sense, whether that is to be done without such a change as will gain the government the confidence of the people? I do not think it at all unlikely, that, with now-and-then a short interval of repose, the war may continue for another twelve or fifteen years. To settle in any thing like tranquillity so many new dynasties and orders of things cannot be the work of a few years. Those of us who are now in the prime of life will have beards of a very grizly hue long before Europe will again know the blessings of real peace. And, I ask you, even you, *Mr. Windham*, who seem to be the most resolutely bent against any change in our interpal state, whether you seriously believe, that this nation can, during such a conflict, preserve its independence, with such heart-burnings, such never-ceasing jealousies and suspicions, such universal distrust, as now prevail, and which will continue to prevail, until the people see themselves fully and fairly represented in the House of Commons? How vain have been all our attempts to stem the torrent of revolution, in every part of Europe! Victories we have sometimes gained; immense armies we have brought, by our money, into the field; we have formed leagues and covenants in abundance; we have roused to

war even those who seemed disposed to be quietly conquered; our all-persuading gold has made the wretchedest cowards upon earth expose their breasts to the bayonet; nor have we been wanting in bribing to our aid any passion or any folly of which the human heart is susceptible. But, still the fire of revolution goes on; and, instead of damping, we really seem to feed the flame. How narrow, then, how pitiful must be the mind, which can entertain the hope of any general or durable advantage from the efforts of the Wellesleys, for instance, in Spain and Portugal; or from any such attempts! Thus we go on, from day to day, from expedient to expedient, adopting any thing rather than that, which, by making us *sound at home*, would enable us to set the world at defiance. However men may disagree as to particular principles of politics, there is one generally prevailing persuasion; and that is, that, *as we are*, we cannot long continue. Some look forward to *peace* as the day of deliverance from danger; others, still more sanguine, entertain the mad hope of over-turning Napoleon; but, all agree, that, without some change in our favour, we cannot long proceed. Well, then, why fly to these uncertain sources of hope? Why not adopt a change completely within our power? A change which, though even the glorious navy were annihilated, would render England secure? — To return, for a moment, to the Meeting, I was not surprized to hear Mr. WILLIAM SMITH full of the “*difficulties*” attending our exertions; but, I am very far from agreeing with him in opinion. The country never saw the necessity of reform so plainly as it does *now*. That necessity is seen and felt, from one end of the kingdom to the other. There is but one opinion and one feeling amongst all well-informed men, not supported by the public money. This never was the case before. The thing is now demanded from a conviction of its necessity to preserve us from utter ruin; and, suppose it were to be a work of *years* instead of *months*, if we die ourselves without enjoying the fruit of our labour, we have children to leave behind us. Those who are now *boys* will soon be *men*; and, we should always bear in our minds, that, it is into their minds that our principles will be instilled.—*Steadiness in perseverance* is the most valuable quality in all enterprizes of this sort. There must be no hurry. The thing will not be hurried; but we must not *relax*, and above all things, we must not give way to pique or

disgust. We must resolve to be *forbearing* towards one another, always remembering, that our enemies are knit together by the double principle of guilt and fear.

MR. WHITE'S PETITION.—This Petition, which I have inserted below, I beg leave most earnestly to recommend to the attentive perusal of every reader. It contains matter of instruction as well as of information.—In my next I have some few observations to make with respect to it. —By those who really love their country, the case of this gentleman will never be forgotten; and, for presenting his Petition, Mr. Whitbread has my unsigned thanks.

*Botley, May 3.*

---

PETITION OF MR. HENRY WHITE.—*Presented to the House of Commons, by Mr. Whitbread, on the 24th of April, 1809.*

SHEWETH,

That your Petitioner is the sole Proprietor of the Independent Whig Newspaper, which, from its first commencement, has been, and still is, printed at No. 23, in Warwick-square, within the said city of London: and that your Petitioner is now a prisoner in the County Gaol of the county of Dorset, in pursuance of the Sentence of the Court of Pleas, held before the King himself at Westminster, (usually called the Court of King's Bench) which sentence was pronounced at Westminster, a place not within the said City of London, contrary to the rights and privileges of the Citizens of the said City.

Your Petitioner published, in his said Newspaper in Warwick-square, within the said City, in the months of December, 1807, and January, 1808, certain Letters, signed “T. C.” “Humanitas,” “A Seaman,” and “Junius,” for which Publications criminal Informations were filed, *ex officio*, against your Petitioner by the King's Attorney-General, in Hilary Term, 1808, at Westminster, a place without the said City of London, although a Grand Jury of the Citizens of the said City was sitting at the very time within the said City; in which Informations, it was alledged that the above named Publications were scandalous and malicious libels, though the said Publications were not alledged to be in any particular false or untrue. Now it is not only the privilege of the Citizens of the said City, but the acknowledged right of every subject of the British empire who is accused of crimes and misdemeanors, to have an Indictment preferred before the best men of his County, who are

to determine whether there be sufficient cause to put him on his trial; but, as a Grand Jury is not always sitting, and as danger might arise to the State in some cases from the delay of assembling a Grand Jury, the practice of filing a criminal Information before the King at Westminster has been tacitly conceded to the Attorney-General of the Crown, at such times as no Grand Jury shall be assembled; but it has never been contended that the subject should be deprived of the privilege of having his case submitted to a Grand Jury of his County, before he be put upon his trial, except where pernicious consequences to the State would arise from the delay of calling together such Jury; but this could not obtain in the case of your Petitioner, because a Grand Jury of his County, namely, of the City of London, were actually sitting at the very time the criminal Informations were filed against him at Westminster.

Your Petitioner humbly craves leave to remind your honourable House that it was not even alledged in the said criminal Informations that the matter which gave rise to them was false or untrue, though the matter was alledged to be scandalous and malicious, and that it was the usage of the Court of King's Bench, till within the last forty years, not to permit any Information to be filed for libellous matter, which was not alledged to be *false* as well as *malicious*, and indeed the most recent determination on the subject coincides with the opinions uniformly maintained by our ancestors; for, in the case of Sir John Carr, and Hood and Sharpe, the Plaintiff did not recover in action for a publication which was true, though admitted to be malicious and injurious.

Your Petitioner having had a criminal information filed against him, of the nature, and under the circumstances above stated, the Solicitor for the Crown moved for a Special Jury, to which motion the Judges of the Court of King's Bench acceded, and a Special Jury was awarded of such Freeholders who were entered in the Freeholders' Book belonging to the Sheriff, with the addition of Freeholder and Merchant, which Special Jury was struck, not by the Sheriff, but by the Master of the Crown-Office, who is a servant of the Crown,—the Prosecutor in this instance;—and the names were not taken as named by the said Master, but several were passed over after he had named them, because he stated them to be not likely to attend, thereby subverting one of the principles of British

justice, which directs that a Jury shall be *impartially* selected, and attendance enforced by fines of the Court; and, indeed, the Master of the Crown-Office might prevent all impartial persons from being summoned on a Jury destined to try between the Crown and the Subject, if every name be passed over which he determines to be a person not likely to attend. And this conduct of the Returning Officer is conceived to be strong presumptive evidence that he knows the characters of the persons to be summoned, and has the power of acting with partiality, which power is contrary to the Constitution of these realms, and is strongly guarded against by the laws, in cases where no attempts are made to take the trial out of the common course of justice; for, the Under-Sheriff (who summons Juries) cannot continue in office longer than one year, nor be re-chosen till after an interval of two years, lest, from his familiarity with office, he may be enabled to select a partial Jury.

Your Petitioner also reminds this Honourable House, that, by a Statute of the 7th and 8th year of King William 3, (ch. 32,) it is enacted, that “every summons of any person qualified to any of the aforesaid services, (namely, serving on Juries,) shall be made by the Sheriff, his Officer, or lawful Deputy, six days before, at the least;” but in the case of your Petitioner, the summonses to the Jury were not delivered six days before the day of trial, nor five days before, nor four days before; from which cause your Petitioner was not able to avail himself of a trial before a Special Jury, contrary to the Rights of the Subject and the law of the land; and this circumstance of not summening the Jury six days before the trial, contrary to the positive and explicit enactments of the law of the land, has prevented your Petitioner from being tried by a Jury of such men as had been assigned him as his Peers.

Your Petitioner was not tried by a Jury of his Peers; for, as the Court of King's Bench had ruled that a Jury of Freeholders and Merchants were his Peers, it necessarily follows that those who were neither Freeholders nor Merchants could not be his Peers; and yet those who were added to the Special Jury were neither Freeholders nor Merchants, and therefore were not his Peers:—and of a Jury composed of men who were all of them neither Peers of your Petitioner, nor Peers among themselves, a verdict was given.

Your Petitioner also craves the attention of this Honourable House, to the words used by sir Nash Grose on the trial, in his charge to the Jury, which your Petitioner humbly presumes to have been a deviation from the spirit of the Constitution, which enjoins lenity and impartiality to form the basis of the conduct of every British Judge, to have been also inimical to the letter and fair interpretation of the Act of Parliament entitled "An Act to remove doubts respecting the functions of Juries in cases of *Libel*," which Act directs, that "on every such trial, the Court or Judge before whom such Indictment or Information shall be tried, shall, according to his or their discretion, give their or his opinion and directions to the Jury in the matter in issue between the King and the Defendant or Defendants, *in like manner as in all other criminal cases.*"—Your Petitioner therefore prays to submit, for the decision of this Honourable House, the propriety or impropriety of the following words, as used by sir Nash Grose on this occasion, and which instead of delivering an opinion or direction, "as in all other criminal cases," are conceived by your Petitioner to be unprecedented in the annals of modern British jurisprudence. The words that your Petitioner complains of, and which were taken down at the time by Mr. Farquharson, the short-hand writer, are as follows:—"In order to shew that they are *most wicked, gross, and abominable Libels*, it is only necessary to read, not ALL, but *one or two of them*. But, Gentlemen, under this Act of Parliament, I am to give you my opinion upon these Publications, and I have no hesitation in saying that any thing more libellous I never heard read: in my opinion they are *gross, scandalous, and abominable Libels!*"

Your Petitioner humbly submits to the benignity of this Honourable House, whether these words ought not to have been considered, in strict impartiality, as sufficiently strong, in giving the opinion and direction of the Judge as warranted by the Act of Parliament above alluded to, without the addition of the following unprecedented expression:—"But, really, Gentlemen, I think it will be throwing dust in your eyes if I say I entertain the least doubt on the subject."—Your Petitioner humbly submits, whether an opinion and direction of the Judge thus given, and that without having read a tittle of the Libels in question, or the defence that had been urged to the Jury, comes within

the meaning either of the Letter or the Spirit of the British Constitution. And the necessity of a Jury being Peers among themselves as well as Peers to the Defendant, has been ever recognized and insisted upon by the British Constitution, because, otherwise, the master and the servant, the creditor and the debtor, the employer and employed, might be inclosed in the same Jury Box, in which case it would imply an absurdity to assert that such Jury were Peers among themselves; for, the same individuals could not at the same time be both dependants and equals; and, if a Jury be not Peers among themselves, they cannot ALL be Peers to the Defendant, and their verdict may not be a free and unbiased verdict.

And forasmuch as it is enacted by the Bill of Rights that "Jurors ought to be duly empanelled and returned;" and as no Juror can be duly returned who is not summoned six days at least before the day of trial, the Jurors summoned not four days before the trial of your Petitioner, were not duly returned.

And forasmuch as it is the privilege of the citizens of the city of London to be tried and adjudged within the said city, though your Petitioner has been tried (if the issue committed to a Jury not duly impanelled and returned can be called a trial,) yet he has not been adjudged within the said city, contrary to the privileges of the citizens of the said city, and, therefore, such judgment being contrary to these privileges, is contrary to the Law of the Land, which has confirmed and established them.

And forasmuch as your Petitioner, if adjudged within the said city, could only have been adjudged to confinement within the prisons of the Sheriff's of the said city and county of Middlesex, it follows that a judgment which implies banishment from the said city, as well as confinement, is contrary to the lawful privileges of the citizens of the city, and when pronounced on a citizen in a place without the said city, for an alleged offence committed within the said city, is believed to be a violation of the Law of the Land, which acknowledges and confirms these privileges.

Your Petitioner also humbly craves leave to observe that the measure of punishment assigned to him for the publication of the said Letters is equal to the measure of punishment assigned in any case where the Libel was proved to be

false, though the truth of the publications of your Petitioner has never been called in question.

Your Petitioner also humbly states, that, when he was removed from the prison of the Court of King's Bench to the County Gaol of Dorchester, he was consigned to the Magistrates' custody, as will appear from an Order of Sessions, made at the Midsummer Quarter-Sessions for the County of Dorset, respecting his treatment in confinement, though by the Law of the Land, he could only be committed to the Sheriff's custody, (allowing for the sake of argument, that he might be imprisoned in a different county from that in which the offence was committed, and it is allowed for the sake of argument only). Now, the Magistrates of any county have no jurisdiction except what is given them by Statute, and no jurisdiction is given to them by Statute over a person convicted of misdemeanor, who is, during his confinement, *emphatically*, a Sheriff's Prisoner. Your Petitioner, therefore, is placed by his sentence in a situation which the law knows not, and therefore he prays the consideration of his case may receive the attention of this Honourable House, not on his personal account, but as his treatment may be drawn into a precedent inimical to the freedom and liberties of the Subjects of these realms.

That your Petitioner further submits to your Honourable House some peculiar privations and hardships to which he has been subjected since his confinement in Dorchester-Gaol, which commenced on the evening of the 6th of July, 1808, and when your Petitioner was labouring under a very severe and afflicting state of illness, which had been proved to the Judges of the Court of King's Bench by the affidavits of four most respectable Medical Gentlemen. That notwithstanding this infirm state of your Petitioner's health; he was denied, by the controlling Magistrates of Dorchester prison, for the interval of more than three months, viz. from the 6th of July to the 15th of the ensuing October, all access to the open air, even to the taking ordinary exercise, unless your Petitioner would take the same in a small circular stone yard, which was allotted in common for prisoners who were sentenced for fines, such as Smugglers and those who had evaded the Excise-Laws, &c. &c. Your Petitioner's complaint being a long standing bilious disorder, attended with a complication of alarming symptoms, among which he was subject to an almost

continued swimming in the head, and a partial stagnation of the circulation of the blood in his feet, he found, after trial, that the walking on the stones and the circular direction in which he was obliged to walk aggravated his disorder to such an excess, that he was obliged to abandon the attempt; and, although he represented this frequently, by letter and otherwise, to the visiting Magistrates, and intreated that he might be permitted to walk in the garden, as Mr. Gilbert Wakefield, Mr. Redhead Yorke, and all other prisoners in similar situations, had been permitted to do before him, this was refused him, until he partially obtained the indulgence, through the benevolent interposition of Mr. Calcraft, one of the Magistrates for the County, and the representation being first made to him by the Medical Gentleman attending the prison, that he considered your Petitioner's being permitted to walk in the garden essential to the preservation of his health. In consequence of this interference and this representation, your Petitioner has, since the 15th of October last, been permitted to walk in the garden, in company of the Gaoler of the prison, for the very limited space of one half an hour every day, and which limited indulgence your Petitioner's health has been such as almost to preclude him from availing himself of. Your Petitioner, therefore, humbly submits to this Honourable House that such extreme coercion and restriction is not necessary for the secure confinement of your Petitioner, and is inconsistent with the benign spirit of the British Constitution. Your Petitioner, in candor and justice, begs leave to state that he considers this restriction as being personally cruel towards him, because, since his confinement in the Gaol of Dorchester, an unlimited indulgence in walking in the garden has been extended to a *FELON*, by the partial courtesy of the Magistrates, and your Petitioner having given no cause of complaint against the propriety of his conduct, to justify such restriction.

In addition to this heavy grievance, your Petitioner begs to state that his family consists of a wife and two sons:—that, from the enjoyment of all personal intercourse with one of his sons, whose business confines him in London, he is wholly bereaved, by the great distance which separates them:—that his wife and his other son have taken lodgings at Dorchester, at an immense increased expense to your Petitioner, for the purpose of mitigating his calamity as much as possible by the com-

forts of their society; but hitherto they have only been admitted, by the order of the Magistrates, alternately to visit him for three days in a week, and each day limited to eight hours, with the exception of your Petitioner's wife, for some weeks past, having been permitted to be with him on a Sunday, and during the night, in consequence of the Medical Gentleman attending him having given it as his opinion that it was indispensably necessary, on account of the alarming state of your Petitioner's health.

Your Petitioner trusts that this Honourable House will liberally consider what a cruel aggravation this must be, merely arising from the local rules of the Magistrates, and neither expressed in the sentence, nor warranted by the Bill of Rights; for, surely every father and husband must deem that imprisonment cruel which confines a man for three years, and allows him only twenty-four hours in each week to have intercourse with his wife and child. That your Petitioner has confined himself, in these instances, to a simple statement of facts, and commits the whole to the benignity, discretion, and wisdom, of your Honourable House.

Your Petitioner submits to the consideration of this Honourable House, the extreme severity of the sentence passed upon him, as being contrary to the Rights and Liberties of every British subject in these realms, guaranteed to them by the Bill of Rights, which expressly says, "that excessive fines ought not to be imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted," your Petitioner having already suffered, under a state of severe and dangerous illness, upwards of nine months imprisonment and banishment in Dorchester-Gaol, from his home, his business, and the County where he was tried, and which has already subjected him to a pecuniary expense of upwards of £.500, and which, unless mitigated by the interference of this Honourable House, it is more than probable will prove fatal to the life of your Petitioner, and ruinous to his circumstances, and future welfare of his family.

And your Petitioner most humbly craves that he may be permitted to prove the truth of his allegation before a Select Committee, or at the Bar of your Honourable House, and he prays such relief as in your wisdom shall seem meet.

HENRY WHITE.

PROCEEDINGS  
IN COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &c. re-

lative to the recent INQUIRY in the House of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK. (Continued from p.658.)

BURGH OF ANNAN, (continued.)

2. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir Francis Burdett, bart., lord vise. Folkestone, J. C. Curwen, esq., S. Whitbread, esq., general Fergusson, and sir S. Romilly, knt., and to the other members, who voted in support of Mr. Wardle's motion, and to the Minority who spoke or voted against the motion of the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

3. Resolved unanimously, That the Evidence lately brought before the House of Commons—the discussion that followed on that evidence—and the decision of the majority, afford the most convincing proof, that such a Reform as will place the ministers of the crown under the controul of an independant and vigilant Parliament, consisting of the true representatives of the people, is essentially necessary to the safety of this kingdom; and in short, that all the steps which have hitherto been taken in this most momentous affair, are of no avail, but as they stand preparatory to a radical Reform in the Commons House of Parliament.

4. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the independent Citizens of London and Westminster, for the manly and patriotic manner, in which they have come forward on the present occasion, as well as upon others of a similar nature, with a free expression of their sentiments, thereby affording a glorious example to the other inhabitants of the kingdom. And the Meeting are impelled by their feelings to express a hope, that these patriotic bodies of men will persevere in the noble cause they have espoused, and which from their local situation they are so well calculated to maintain, until corruption, chased from all its biding places, shall have fled the country, and left the constitution to operate on its true and genuine principles.

5. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Richard Forest, esq., Provost of this Burgh, for the promptness and alacrity with which he acquiesced in the request to call the present Meeting; and to Bailie Scott, the Chairman of the Meeting, for the becoming manner in which he has conducted himself while in the Chair.

6. Resolved unanimously, That these Resolutions be signed by the Chairman, and inserted in a London newspaper, and

in such of the provincial papers as will give sufficient publicity to the sentiments they contain.—(Signed) JAMES SCOTT, Chairman.

#### BOROUGH OF CARMARTHEN.

At a Meeting of the Mayor, Burgesses, and respectable Inhabitants of the said Borough, held at the Guildhall, in the said Borough, on the 5th of April, 1809, convened in pursuance of a requisition delivered to the Mayor of the said Corporation for a Common Hall to consider of the propriety of addressing a Vote of Thanks to COLONEL WARDLE, for his conduct in Parliament on a late occasion.—WILLIAM MORGAN, esq. Deputy Mayor, in the Chair. It was unanimously Resolved,

That conscious of the blessings we derive from the Constitution under which we live, and anxious to perpetuate them pure and unsullied, we cannot but look on every man who has courage and manliness to oppose the inroad of corruption, and stem the torrent of vice, by which its excellencies are perverted, and even its vitality endangered, as the best friend to the Throne, the truest friend to his country. Impressed with this conviction, we cannot but be sensible of the services rendered by Col. Wardle, who, with unexampled intrepidity and most persevering industry, so eminently, and so honourably displayed on a late occasion in Parliament, instituted and prosecuted inquiries into abuses tending to the degradation of the Army, and subversive of its dearest interests; which, in opposition to every discouragement and difficulty, he made manifest to the nation, and for which he is justly entitled to the approbation and acknowledgments of every well-wisher to his King and his Country. We, therefore, participating in the general sentiment of gratitude such patriotism merits, and in some degree also actuated by a laudable, though national feeling of pride and exultation, that the object of this Address derives his origin from Cambrian Blood, beg leave to tender to G. L. Wardle, esq. our grateful acknowledgments for the services done to his country: and while we thus cordially return him our thanks, we cannot but regret that, restricted as we are by the Constitution of our Charter, we are prevented from gratifying our warmest wishes in presenting to so honourable and independent a character the Freedom of our ancient Borough.

Resolved, That the Thanks of this Meeting, as well as of the whole country, are justly due to sir F. Burdett, bart. lord

vise. Folkestone, S. Whitbread, esq. sir S. Romilly, knt. general Ferguson, and the rest of the glorious Minority, who so ably supported Col. Wardle through his arduous undertakings in the late Investigation.

#### TOWN OF SHEFFIELD.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of Sheffield (at which not less than Five Thousand Persons were assembled), convened by public Advertisement, and held this day April 12, at the Cutlers' hall, and adjourned from thence to Paradise-square, Mr. E. RHODES, Master Cutler, in the Chair.

It was Resolved unanimously,—1. That, ardently as we wish to promote the welfare and prosperity of our country, and warmly attached as we are to its true Constitutional Government, we cannot but deeply lament, that such shameful instances of corruption, such undue influence, and such unwarrantable practices, should ever have existed, as have been developed by the late proceedings of the House of Commons.

Resolved unanimously,—2. That Gwynlllyn Lloyd Wardle, esq., by instituting the Inquiry which has brought this scene of corruption before the judgment of the public, has deserved eminently well of his country, and that the Thanks of this Meeting, with feelings of respectful gratitude, be presented to him for the manly, firm, and independent manner in which, amidst great discouragements; undaunted by threats of infamy and heavy responsibility; equally unconnected with, and unsupported by party—he has conducted this important and patriotic Inquiry.

Resolved unanimously,—3. That we also wish to convey the Approbation and the Thanks of this Meeting to sir Francis Burdett, who seconded Mr. Wardle's Motion, to lord Folkestone, Mr. Whitbread, sir Samuel Romilly, general Ferguson, admiral Markham, and all those Members of the House of Commons who voted in the Minorities on the several questions which arose in the course of this most interesting Investigation.

Resolved unanimously,—4. That the particular Thanks of this Meeting be given to William Wilberforce, esq., and the right hon. lord vise. Milton, the two Representatives of this extensive and populous county, for the discriminating and independent sanction and support afforded by them to Mr. Wardle, in his meritorious efforts to detect and counteract

abuses so injurious to the real interests of the Government, and so detrimental to the welfare of the people.

Resolved unanimously,—5. That, we thus openly express our sentiments, conceiving it to be the duty of a Free People, when strongly urged by transactions which materially affect the essential interests of the whole community, to declare their opinions, unbiased by party consideration, in order that independent men may be thereby encouraged steadily to pursue those just, rational, and constitutional measures which will eventually root out every species of corruption, and prevent the repetition of similar evil practices, and which will also prove an effectual security against a profuse and unnecessary expenditure of public money.

Resolved unanimously,—6. That these Resolutions be transcribed on parchment, and remain for signatures at the Cutlers' Hall, for 14 days from the date hereof.

Resolved unanimously,—7. That these Resolutions be printed and published in Hand-bills, in the Sheffield Papers, and otherwise, as the Chairman and the Gentlemen who moved the Resolutions may direct.—E. RHODES.

WORCESTER, APRIL 13, 1809.

At a very numerous and respectable Meeting of the Freemen and other Inhabitants of this City in Common Hall assembled, pursuant to Public Notice, in order to consider of the Propriety of coming to certain Resolutions relative to the late Investigation into the Conduct of the Commander in Chief of his Majesty's Land Forces.—HERBERT ROGERS, esq. Mayor, in the Chair.—The following Resolutions were agreed to;

Resolved unanimously, 1. That it is the opinion of this Meeting that the late Investigation into the Conduct of the Commander in Chief of his Majesty's Land Forces, has disclosed the existence of gross Abuses and Corruption in that and other Departments of the State.

2. Resolved unanimously, That Gwynn Lloyd Wardle, esq., for the dauntless intrepidity displayed by him in proposing the said Investigation, and for the cool, yet steady perseverance with which he conducted himself to the termination thereof, is entitled to the Thanks of this Meeting, and in their estimation to the gratitude of his Country.

3. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting are in a special manner due to sir Francis Burdett, bart.; to lord viscount Folkestone, to lord viscount Althorpe, to S. Whitbread, esq., to sir S. Romilly, to major general Ferguson, and to C. W. Wynne, esq., for their able, manly, and patriotic exertion on the above occasion.

4. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to our worthy Representatives, William Gordon, esq., and A. Robarts, esq., to the first for the Vote which he so honourably gave with Mr. Wardle; and the latter for the conscientious and correct view, which it appears by a letter now produced from him, he held upon the occasion, but which we are sorry to learn his ill state of health prevented him from following up with his vote.

5. Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the hon. William H. Lyttelton, M. P. for this County, to the hon. Andrew Foley and sir Thomas Winnington, bart. M. P. for the Borough of Droitwich, and to Humphry Haworth, esq., M. P. for the Borough of Evesham, both within this County, and to the other Members composing the Minority of 125 who divided with Mr. Wardle.

6. Resolved unanimously, That his Royal Highness the Duke of York, by resigning his situation of Commander in Chief, has acted in conformity with the wishes of the people in opposition to the Majority of the House of Commons, and it is the opinion of this Meeting, that if any Person, at any future period, should advise his Majesty to reinstate him, he will, by such advice, prove himself an enemy to his Country.

7. Resolved, That the late Decision in the House of Commons has disappointed the hopes and expectations of the people, and convinces us of the necessity of a speedy and effectual Reform in the Representation of the Commons in Parliament, as a security to the Throne, a support to the nobility, and a safe-guard to the people against that tide of corruption, which has laid so many nations of Europe prostrate at the feet of the ruler of France.

The above Resolutions were carried by a large Majority.—(Signed) HERBERT ROGERS, Chairman and Mayor.

(To be continued.)

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 19.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 13, 1809.

[Price 1s.

" Do you think it possible to get me a vote on Monday, for Pitt's motion?"

Mrs. CLARKE'S Letter to Capt. SANDON.

705]

[706]

## SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

AUSTRIA.—The reader will, perhaps, remember, that, when the present war between Austria and France was first talked of, I endeavoured to convince the ministerial writers, that their *joy* at the prospect of such a war would speedily be turned into mourning; and that, by their exertions to urge Austria on to war, they were, supposing their exertions to have any effect, urging her on to her destruction. The editor of the Morning Chronicle made similar observations, and for so doing he was most severely censured by his party opponents, who, according to their old manner of turning every thing to a party account, accused his friends of wishing to see Buonaparté master of the continent, and who failed not to hold themselves forth as the real friends of the "*liberties*," as they termed it, of Europe.—The recently received intelligence must, one would suppose, have convinced these *Anti-Jacobins*, that we were right, and that they were wrong. But, it is no matter whether they be so convinced, or not. Their readers, indeed, one would desire to see undeceived; yet, perhaps, it may, since deception has been carried on so long, be full as well to leave the work of removing that deception to *time* and *events*.—The fate of Austria will do little, perhaps, in the way of *warning* to despotic governments. They have already had so many warnings, that, it really seems, that they are doomed to destruction. Talk of *armies*, indeed! What has this famous army of Austria done? Suppose the French to have made only *thirty thousand* prisoners: I believe, that they have made all they say they have made; but, suppose it to be only *thirty thousand*; how are thirty thousand men to be made prisoners, in an open country, *against their will*? There is no such thing. It cannot be. Why, that must occupy a length of line of *six or seven miles*. What can surround six or seven miles? Only consider how many men it must take to surround a line of six or seven miles long. The Austrians were the first in the field; they had chosen their ground;

nor is it to be believed, that they had neglected to secure the means of covering their retreat. Yet, down they fall like so many men made of paste-board. No, no: it is evident, that they had no stomach for the fight; and, when that is the case, numbers, and what is called discipline, are of no avail.—Some persons expressed great admiration of the Archduke's Proclamations upon entering Germany; his complaints against the ambition of Napoleon, and his protestations about the Emperor of Austria's desire to preserve peace. Alas! these were known well enough before. But, in these what interest had the *people* of Germany? Aye, or the *people* of Austria? The question with them was: "shall we be worse off under the Emperor "Napoleon than under the Emperor "Francis?" This was the question, and the only rational question, with them. Intriguing courtiers, sinecure placemen and meritless pensioners; all those who live in idleness upon the fruit of the public labour, may and will abuse the people for this indifference; but, if they would give themselves time to consider, they would see the unreasonableness of all such abuse. They themselves are anxious for the preservation of their several old governments; and this is very natural, because, to them, those governments operate to great advantage; they live easy and comfortable lives under those governments; they, without any labour or care or talent, are getting rich under those governments; but, upon the very same principle that they are so anxious for the preservation of such governments, the people, out of whose property and labour they enrich themselves, must be indifferent to the fate of those governments; or, rather, they must wish for a change, without troubling themselves with nice calculations as to the good or the evil, which that change is calculated to produce.—Here is the real cause of all the triumphs of Napoleon. We hear stories about his carrying *millions of pieces of gold* with him, wherewith to corrupt the Austrian officers; a fact, if true, that seems to be a pretty

good answer to those, who talk about the *poverty* of the French government, *owing to the loss of commerce*, and also to those, who would persuade us of the virtue of the Austrians; but, this is a mere invention; a falsehood hatched for the purpose of misleading us; for, how is it *possible* for us to have any knowledge of such a fact. No; bribery, in this case, was, I am persuaded, unnecessary. He met, and he well knew that he should meet, with nothing like *a spirit of resistance*. The body of an army he knew he should have to meet; but, of the body without a soul he was not at all afraid.—These truths have long been very clear to all men of tolerably accurate information as to such matters; and, it is surprizing to see with what industry and pertinacity they are disguised from the mass of the people of this country. It is surprizing, because one can see no adequate reason for it. Why should not the people be told the truth, relative to the cause of Napoleon's success in other countries? Why not tell them, what we know to be true, that he triumphs because the people of the countries, against which he makes war, are indifferent as to whether he becomes their ruler, or not?—As to the effect, upon the general interests of Europe, which the apparent approaching fall of Austria will have, it is difficult to offer a decided opinion. With respect to *our own interests*, the change, whatever it may be, does not appear to me to be an object of dread. I do not see how it is to affect us any more than a revolution in Kamtschatka would. We are now, and long have been, cut off from all connection with Austria. The only interest that we can reasonably feel, with respect to her, is, for the happiness of her people. I am far from being certain, that the total conquest of Austria might not, by diverting, in part, the attention and the force of Napoleon; by extending his dominion, multiplying the objects of his care, and, of course, dividing his means, operate, for sometime, at least, in favour of England; while, in another point of view, which is too evident to dwell upon, the advantage to us is certain. — Having finished his work on the side of Germany, he will, indeed, be enabled to turn his whole force upon *Spain and Portugal*; and hence, in time, there must arise danger to this country, and particularly to *Ireland*, unless something efficacious be speedily adopted to render Ireland more secure internally than it now is. But, this would have happened, and sooner too, if Napoleon

had not renewed the war with Austria. — In short, viewing the matter in whatever way I will, I cannot, as an Englishman, discover any grounds for deciding, that the late triumph of France over Austria ought to be a subject of very deep regret. I do not like to see Napoleon triumph, because *he is a despot*; I wish the triumph had settled upon another head; upon the head of a different sort of man; but, I do not, and cannot, see that the triumph itself is calculated to produce any mischievous effect.—There is one argument in favour of Austria's going to war, which, even after the hitherto fatal consequences are known, is still persisted in, and which is too curious to be passed over unnoticed. It is this: that Napoleon had resolved, and had the power, to destroy Austria, whether she went to war, or not; and that, therefore, she might as well make a trial to save herself; she might as well take her chance of the consequences of a war. Supposing the premises to be true, the conclusion is certainly correct; and, if those who make use of the argument, will but be so good as to apply it to the case of an oppressed people, I think they will soon cease to be surprized at the indifference of such a people, and at their readiness to take the *chances of a change*. But, is it not shocking to hear it coolly asserted, that Napoleon, or that any prince, has *resolved* upon conquering a nation, which contains from twelve to twenty millions of people; and that it is wise for the sovereign of such nation to rush into a war, in order to obtain a *chance* of escaping being conquered? Why, does not this assertion amount to a confession, that the *people* of such nation are of no weight at all; that they take no interest in the matter; or, that they, at bottom, wish for the success of Napoleon? What should have given him such confidence with respect to the conquest of Austria? The answer is ready: he knew, or, at least, he had very good reason for believing, that the twenty millions of people, living in the Austrian dominions, were not disposed to resist him.—*Party*, as usual, has laid hold of this defeat of the Austrians, to call for a *change of ministry in England*. Good Lord! As if that would alter the case; as if that would make either the people or the army of Austria more disposed to a resistance of the French! The shape, in which this argument assails the common sense of the country, is this: that the defeat of the Austrians will add to the means, which Napoleon has of injuring us; that we shall

stand in need of more wise and vigorous councils than we now have, in order to enable us to resist this increase of means in the hands of our enemy; that the late ministers are more wise and vigorous than the present; and that, therefore, the present ought to be turned out and the late restored to power. As I do not agree in *any one* of the premises, I, of course, reject the conclusion; and, I firmly believe, that a change of ministry, at this time, would be greatly injurious to the country. There would be new lords to make; and, which is much worse, there would be a new batch of pensioners to be fastened upon the public. The feelings and views of both *parties*, towards the people, is evidently the same. There is no difference whatever; and, in point of diligence and ability, the present men are, upon an average, I verily believe, quite equal to their predecessors. It was not, even in the affair of Spain, *ability* that was wanting. It was a want of right principles; the losses and disgrace, arising from our interference in the southern Peninsula of Europe, are to be ascribed, not to a want of ability in the ministers, but to that vicious system, which affects our foreign as well as our domestic concerns, and to which system the late ministers have shewn clearly to the whole nation, that they are full as much attached as the present.

MR. MADOCKS'S MOTION.—On the 5th instant Mr. Madocks made a motion, in the House of Commons, for taking an examination at the bar of the House, upon the subject of a charge which he had to make against MR. PERCEVAL and LORD CASTLEREAGH, relating to the disposing of a seat in that House. This motion was negatived upon the ground of its not being sufficiently specific; and, as it will be brought forward in another shape, I shall not now offer any remarks upon the alleged fact itself. Indeed, the charge will have been made according to the taste of the parties themselves, before this sheet can issue from the press.—There was, however, something said, during the debate, respecting the proceedings at *Public Meetings*, which is well worthy of the attention of every reader.—It seems odd, at first sight, that the conduct of the Meetings of the People, in the several counties and towns of the kingdom, should have formed any part of the topics, on this occasion, when so heavy a charge, as that of having been guilty of corruption, was preferred against two of the King's ministers; but, we remember the cry of *Jacobinism*;

the cry of a *Jacobin Conspiracy*, when Mr. Wardle preferred his charges against the Duke of York; and, remembering this, our surprize upon the present occasion will naturally be the less. But, let us now hear what was said about those Meetings, which the people have held for the purpose of thanking the man, whom the ministers declared they would not suffer, *without opposition*, to receive the thanks of the House of Commons. Let us hear what was said about these Meetings.—MR. BRAGGE, according to the report of the debate, was the first. He is stated to have said, that, “he conceived there was some-“thing extremely irregular in the form of“ proceeding proposed by the Hon. Mem-“ber. It was a form of proceeding better“adapted to the genius and spirit of one“of the Meetings that were so frequent, and“so industriously promoted, than befitting“the temper and dignity of that House.“It would well become that Meeting, in“which the extraordinary proposition was“made and approved, that a man holding a“place under Government was not fit to sit“in that House. Such propositions were“not intended for the sober consideration“of Parliament. No; their object was“to increase the popular ferment, to add“fuel to fire; and to encourage and pro-“pagate that dangerous spirit that was“circulated with a diligence the most sus-“picious. ‘Spargere voces in vulgus am-“biguas.’—seemed to be the grand princi-“pie of action of the leaders of these“Meetings. Their aim was to cry down“all public men—to render them objects of“distrust and suspicion.”—Now, in the first place, it will be observed, that Mr. Madocks distinctly stated, that he had proofs whereon to ground his charge, and, that as to *ambiguity*, he not only stated the offence, but named the alleged offenders. What ambiguity was here? Was not this quite “tangible” enough? Was this a mere slanderous insinuation, calculated for the purpose of exciting distrust and *suspicion*? On the contrary, did not Mr. Madocks, like Mr. Wardle, expose himself to the consequences of a failure in making good his charges? What could be fairer? Besides, Mr. Madocks was ready to name the other particulars of the case; so that this charge of ambiguity seems to have been the last that could attach to him.—As to the contrast, which Mr. Bragge was pleased to draw between the genius and spirit of the Public Meetings and the dignity of the House, has the reader seen, at any of the Meetings, any thing like popu-

lar fury or folly? Does Mr. GEORGE ROSE discover any thing of this sort in the admirable Resolutions, passed in the town of Southampton, the electors of which have expressed their disapprobation of the parliamentary conduct of his son; or, in those of Christchurch, where he himself has met with something similar? He may; but, the nation will not. The truth is, that the Meetings, upon the present occasion, are without example for their *temper*, as well as their respectability; and, whatever may be said about them in the House of Commons, their utility can no more be doubted than their legality.—As to the “extraordinary proposition,” that *a man holding a place under government was not fit to sit in the House of Commons*, we will first hear Mr. STURGES, upon the same point, and then we will see how the fact stands. He, in the report of the debate, is stated to have said, that “he was proud that he “was no party to such resolutions as “those lately published, stating a clause “in the Act of Settlement as the existing “law of the land, which never was law. “(Here it was observed that it was four “years before it was repealed.) Never till “lately had it been seen in this country, “that bodies of people, not present during “a judicial examination, had met to arraign “the conduct of those who found it *their duty* to acquit one who was accused. “He never till now heard of condemning “the Commons in this manner, for the “exercise of *their duty* in an acquittal. He “could not conceive how those who “called themselves the friends of the “country could reconcile it to their feelings to *degrade the character* of the House “of Commons.”—Here is new matter, and we will dismiss that first. We are told, that it is something new for persons *not present* at an examination, to arraign the conduct of those who have found it *their duty* to acquit the accused. But, Mr. Sturges, Mr. Sturges, do you not perceive, that there has been *something new* in this whole affair? That there was something new in crying out Jacobin Conspiracy, when a member simply preferred specific charges against a person in the public employ and in the public pay? That there was something new in not permitting the accuser to follow the mode of investigation that he proposed? That there was something new in denouncing, before hand, infamy upon the head of that accuser, in case he should fail to make good his charges? That there was something new in the House being, before

it met to decide upon the case, told by the accused, that, unless they acquitted him, they ought not to decide at all? That there was *something new*, very new indeed, in all this, and in a good deal more that passed upon this memorable occasion; and, therefore, I do think, Mr. Sturges, that you might pass over without surprize, a little novelty in the proceedings at the Meetings. But, Sir, you seem totally to have forgotten one thing, and that is, that, owing to the mode of examination which was chosen by the Duke of York’s friends, his excellently good and wise friends, the *whole of the Evidence* was before the public, and that, of course, bating the difference in point of *general understanding*, the public was full as able to decide rightly as those persons were, who were present during the examinations. The public had before them all the Evidence, printed by order of the House itself. What could it have more? And, as to censuring an “acquittal,” why not censure that as well as a condemnation, if they thought it was wrong? In short, if the people have a right to meet, and to express their sentiments relative to the conduct of the House of Commons; if they have a right to do this in any case, the right will serve them in this case as well as in any other; unless, indeed, it should be contended, that the glorious constitution, for which they are called upon “to spend their last “shilling and to shed the last drop of “their blood,” allows them to meet only for the purpose of *praising* the conduct of the parliament.—Now, as to what Mr. Bragge called the “Extraordinary Proposition.” There, surely, is something very reasonable in the proposition, that those who are appointed to be the *guardians of the public money* should not be allowed to take any of that money *themselves*; that they should not be allowed to take it from any quarter, or through any channel, and especially through the Crown, as a *check* upon which the constitution considers them. This appears to be very reasonable; and yet Mr. Sturges said that he, was *proud* that he was no party to a resolution, containing such a proposition. Nay, he is reported to have said that it *never was law*. He was, it appears, contradicted at the time; but I will make the contradiction in a manner a little more formal. The second act, passed in the twelfth year of the reign of WILLIAM III. contains this clause: “That no person, who has “an office, or place of profit, under the “king, or receives a pension from the

" crown, shall be capable of serving as a member of the House of Commons." This clause was, in part, repealed in the 4th year of the reign of Queen Anne, and in part since. It is no longer law, I know very well; but, does that circumstance render it absurd? This act of parliament it was, which placed the crown upon the heads of the king's family. This is no common act of parliament. It is one of the great *constitutional laws*. It changed the dynasty of the kingdom; and, it was made for the express purpose of "further limiting the crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subject."—Now, Mr. Sturges, will you tell me, that this law, like the act for a toll-gate, may be repealed at pleasure, and ought not to be so much dwelt upon, as if its provisions were unchangeable? Will you tell me this, Sir? Well, then, why did you and your party appeal to it; appeal to this very law against the prayers of the Roman Catholics, and tell us, that if the king consented to those prayers, he would violate the act which placed him upon the throne?—Pray answer that, Sir?

At that time, we heard a great deal about the principles which placed the family of Brunswick upon the throne. True, it was one of those principles, that the Roman Catholic religion should not be suffered to predominate; but, the prohibition contained in the clause I have cited above was not less one of those principles, and, give me leave to add, that it was a principle of *much greater importance to the nation*. And yet you (a lawyer, I believe) tell us, that it "never was law!" What would you say, Sir, to any one who should assert, that the family of Brunswick came to the crown without law? Yet, it was that very act of parliament, of which this clause forms a part, that gave them, as all the world knows, their title to the crown. Queen Anne's brother was the heir to the crown, she leaving no child; but, the nation, fearing that this brother would, like his father, violate their rights and liberties, passed an act transferring the right of succession from the House of Stuart to the House of Brunswick; and this, which I have quoted from, was that act. And you are reported to have said, that the part which I have quoted "never was law;" and Mr. Bragge calls it an "extraordinary proposition."—That it was a most wise provision reason itself would have taught us, if experience, woe-ful experience, had not impressed it upon our minds. Had this provision always re-

mained in force, we never should have had to thank Mr. Wardle for what he has done, because neither he nor any one else would have had it to do. Was it not striking; was it not, Sir, sufficient to strike the most stupid observer, that, against the Duke of York not one of the placemen or pensioners was found to vote?—But, if the principle, for which I contend, never was sanctioned by law; if it be so very absurd; why did not you, Sir, when you heard me maintain it, at the last nomination at Winchester, expose my ignorance and absurdity? You were present; you heard me; and why did you not, when the county was assembled to witness your exploit, put me down? Come, come; it will not do to say, that I was beneath your notice. That will not do any longer. The time for that is passed, and you will never see it return. People are now disposed to try things as well as men by the test of truth; and to no other test will they suffer an appeal. Calumny and out-cry have lost their power. If you put me down, therefore, you must do it by true facts or fair argument; and, if you remain silent, the conclusion will be in my favour.—Before I come to what was said as to the general disposition of the Meetings to excite suspicions against, and to make an attack upon, all public men, I must quote from the speech of another member, a gentleman, as it is given in the report, of the name of Gooch, who is stated to have said, "that if the speeches attributed to particular persons were literally so, they went near to destroy what was the most desirable of all things in the present state of the country; he meant the unanimity of the public mind; and tended to more mischief than all their authors could retrieve, if they lived to sit in the House for an hundred years to come. He would give his feeble assistance to the prevention of real abuses, but not to those general attacks of abuses, never known as such till these pure days! These public Meetings could only do mischief. He did not impute improper motives to individuals, but as to voting public thanks to an Hon. Gent. for his patriotism, he would as soon vote them to Mrs. Clarke for her virtue. (A laugh, hear! hear!) He would not be deterred from his opinions by the sentiments of any SET of people. The expressions he had heard imputed to an Hon. Gent., did him no credit as an Englishman. He hoped always to see respectable persons opposing Government. They were

"the guardians of the public interest; "but there was a power behind those "benches (the Opposition benches) greater than those benches themselves. That "power looked not to Parliament, but to "a faction who would get rid of all par- "ties."—Now, taking these several points in their due order, how does Mr. Gooch make it out, that the speeches at public Meetings have tended to destroy the *unanimity* of the public mind. If ever there was, in the whole history of this country, a question upon which the people were *unanimous*, they are so upon the question relating to the Duke of York. How, then, have the speeches, which have been made for the purpose of inducing the people to express their sentiments upon the subject, tended "to *destroy* the unani- "mity of the public mind?"—Mr. Gooch speaks ironically of "these *pure* "days;" but, so did not Mr. Perceval speak, when, as Attorney General, he pro-secuted the poor, ignorant, *Hamlin*, the Tin-man of Plymouth. He, then, talked, in good set terms, of the purity of the present times; and said, that it was due to the age and country, in which we had the honour to live, to declare, that there was no such thing as corruption amongst public men.—Nay, at this very time, there is a government prosecution going on against the office-sellers in the city, ordered by a ministry, of which Lord Castle-reagh is still a member! So, really, I think that the friends of the ministers ought not to make a jest of the *purity* of the times.—Mr. Gooch would not give Mr. Wardle thanks for what he has done. Very well; and Mr. Canning said before hand, that he would oppose a vote of thanks to that gentleman, if it was proposed. That was very well too; but, the *nation* have felt and acted differently; they have thought that he deserved *their* thanks, though he might not deserve the thanks of the ministry or the regular Opposition. Their thanks they are giving him; and, I beg those who talk of the "*ferment* in the public mind;" who talk of "*popular fury*;" I beg them to observe, that these Meetings have been held by *grave corporate bodies* as well as by counties and in common-halls. And, I would beg to remind Mr. Sturges, that, at the county-meeting in Hampshire, all those, who spoke against the adoption of the Resolution, which was proposed by me, did, nevertheless, *decidedly approve of a vote of thanks to Mr. Wardle*, not excepting even the Rev. Mr. Poulter, who is well-

known to be the constant eulogist of the present ministry, and who, at the Meet-ing, was, if possible, still louder and more decided than any other person in praise of Mr. Wardle, and told us that he came to the Meeting for the express purpose of giving to Mr. Wardle *his decided, his warm, his heart-felt thanks*. So that, as to this point, even the partizans of the ministers; their devoted partizans "out of doors," as it is called, differ from Mr. Gooch and Mr. Cannaing, for the loss of whose thanks Mr. Wardle will, probably, be able to console himself, when he reflects that that loss has gained him an expression of the thanks of the whole nation.—Mr. Gooch, like the two gentlemen before-named, complained of *general attacks* upon public men. Why, it was formerly the practice to complain of *personality*. That was the cant cry about a year or two ago. But, how does the fact stand as to these *general attacks*? The Duke of York was individually accused; Lord Castlereagh was so accused; and Mr. Perceval is now so accused, as we have seen, by Mr. Madocks. What ground is there, then, for this complaint of *general attacks*? To be sure, there are very *general suspicions*, and, pray, was not Mr. Creevey's honest and bold declaration very well calculated to excite such suspicions; especially as no one was found to deny the charge made by that gentleman?—In answer to this com-plaint of Mr. Gooch, we have, I think, only to quote the speech of MR. CREEVEY and the answer of MR. PERCEVAL, of the 20th of last month; and, these may, too, serve as an answer to what the Gentleman said about the attempts to cry down *both parties*; for, we shall see, that according to the news-paper report of that memorable de-bate, the answer of Mr. Perceval did not contain any denial of the charge, but a *recrimination upon the late Ministry*; and, indeed, who can have forgotten, that se-veral months of the last session of parlia-ment were taken up in mutual accusations of the two parties; not that I complain of their time having been so employed, being convinced that their *falling out* had an excellent effect upon the nation; but, after that, I really think it a little hard that the *people* should be so abused for enter-taining suspicions of both parties; or for making one general attack upon them. Surely the people may be allowed to think of both, that which each of them boldly says of the other.—But, let us hear Mr. Creevey and Mr. Perceval.—"Mr. Creevey said, that the Noble Lord was

“ perfectly correct in stating, that seats in Parliament had been notoriously bought and sold by the Treasury. He would say, that this was not only his belief, *but that it was within his knowledge.* The Treasury not only openly bought and sold those seats, but they kept in a great degree the monopoly of that market. If this was attempted to be denied by Ministers, he should be glad to have the opportunity of proving it, and he could easily prove it from the lips of any one who had ever been Secretary of the Treasury. It was absolute nonsense and delusion on the public, for the House to spend their time in considering abuses in the Commissioners of the Lottery, and every other minor department, when they knew, and when the public knew, that the greatest of all abuses was constantly practised by every Secretary of the Treasury, in buying and selling seats in Parliament. To talk of a dissolution of Parliament as an appeal to the people was mere mockery and imposition. It was perfectly well known that a dissolution of Parliament was not an appeal to the people, but to the Treasury (*Hear! hear!*)—Although he had great respect for the last government, and owed some personal favours to them, yet he must say, that their dissolution of Parliament, at the end of four years, like the dissolution by the present Ministers, at the end of about four months, was not an appeal to the people but to the Treasury (*Loud cries of Hear! hear!*)—Until the House was disposed to suppress this odious and unconstitutional traffic, the legislating on these minor abuses was mere mockery and delusion.”—These are pretty round assertions. They cannot be misunderstood. The man must be an ideot, who does not understand them clearly. And yet, I am sure that Mr. Gooch will not deny, that the constitution, for which we are called upon, and *are ready*, to spend our last shilling and shed our last drop of blood, does not allow of this sort of traffic; but, on the contrary, distinctly forbids it, under heavy pains and penalties.—Well, then, what says the king’s minister, Mr. PERCEVAL, to this? “ MR. PERCEVAL said, that ‘the Noble Lord had stated his firm belief of the existence of such transactions, and the hon. gent. had gone further, and stated, that it was within his absolute knowledge. The hon. gent. to be sure, might have some knowledge, from the confidence which was reposed in him by the late Administration, with whom he was con-

nected.—(*Loud cries of hear! hear!*)—He could not recollect, however, that the hon. gent. (Mr. Creevey) had, at the time when a specific charge was brought against a Secretary of the Treasury for such interference, given the House the benefit of his knowledge. The House would perceive, that the case he alluded to was, when a charge was brought against a Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Freemantle), for interference in the election of Hampshire, where he was undoubtedly a freeholder. The hon. gent did not then tell the House a word of that practice which was within his own knowledge, of Secretaries of the Treasury corruptly interfering in the election of Members of Parliament. When he had that knowledge, how did it happen that his patriotism was asleep on that remarkable occasion?” — Thus, you see, Mr. Gooch, here is no denial of the fact, but merely a charge against the late ministers of having done the same thing.—Well, then, Sir, can you complain of the people, that they entertain suspicions of, and that they attack, both parties? How, after this, can they possibly have any confidence in either? It is not in nature that they should! and, abuse them who will, they never will have confidence in either again.—Mr. Gooch has, it seems, no objection “to see respectable persons opposing the government; they are the guardians of the public interest;” but, he bitterly complains of a power behind the opposition benches, greater than those benches themselves. Yes, yes; to be sure, an opposition; a regular opposition; this is quite necessary, absolutely necessary, to the support of the system; and, indeed it is notorious, that the parties like one another very well. Respectable persons, such for, instance, as Mr. Sheridan, General Fitzpatrick, and Mr. Tierney; these, it seems, may oppose as long and as loudly as they please; they are the “guardians of the public interest,” though, when in power, their party did pension off *Mrs. Fox and her Daughters*; but, persons like Mr. Whitbread, Sir Francis Burdett, Lord Folkestone, Mr. Wardle, Mr. Lyttleton, Mr. Coke, Mr. Brand, Mr. Madocks, &c. &c. these “persons” must not attempt to oppose government; no, nor to express their opinions. It is odd enough, at first sight, that the ministerial party should be so very angry with these gentlemen, and particularly with Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Wardle, who have distinctly declared that they do not wish

for a change of Ministry; but, the reason is this: that these gentlemen wish to put an end to regular opposition, without which both parties well know, that there is neither "indemnity for the past nor security for the future."—I am quite surprized, that any man in his sober senses, should have conceived the idea of retrieving the reputation of parties. It is a thing as impossible as for him to raise the dead from the grave. Upon no point was the public mind ever more decidedly fixed, than upon this, that both parties are alike with respect to the people, and that it is not of the smallest consequence to the people which of them is in power.—To the speeches, which I have quoted from, there were most triumphant answers given by Mr. Biddulph, Mr. Whitbread; Mr. Brand, and especially by Mr. Lyttleton, who said, that "If the House adopted a moderate and just reform, he believed that the public meetings would be fewer, and less alarming to the Government. They were the natural consequences of the misconduct of the House, and there was no prevention of them by absolute force, but by timely Reform. As for misrepresentations of the press, which were complained of by Gentlemen opposite, had not others, and particularly an Hon. Baronet, been treated to the full, with as little ceremony? He could not believe that the nation would impute to the advocates of Reform what the press imputed to them. Indeed such reports of public meetings would be trampled upon, if the grievances themselves did not actually exist. He concluded by declaring his opinion, that the Ministers of the Crown possessed an undue influence in that House."—I could wish to insert the whole of Mr. Whitbread's Speech, but want of room prevents me. Those parts, however, which relate to *Public Meetings* and to *Reform*, I cannot refrain from inserting.—He said that "a right hon. gent. had thought proper to make some remarks upon gentlemen's attending certain clubs and societies existing for the purpose, as he supposed, of exciting the public mind and inflaming popular passion. What had, in fact, excited the public mind? What, but the results of recent investigations into transactions of public importance! What, but the refusal of the House of Commons to do justice on a Member and a Minister who did not deny his offences. What, without imputing such a design to Ministers, would be the consequence of an attempt to stifle the expression of the public

voice? . . . . . When a cry was raised against public Meetings, because two Ministers were charged with corruption, he felt desirous to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer a few questions, with respect to the means of inflaming the public mind. Was it meant to say that the few persons who were at the recent Meeting could be so extremely dangerous? Was it true or not that gross corruptions existed? He would admit not so gross as in former times, but yet gross enough. Were we so purified? Had we really done enough in the progress of Reform? No, we could never do enough; if the work of Reform ceased, while human nature was human nature, corruption would succeed and triumph. . . . . . Corrupt conduct was imputed to Mr. Spencer Perceval and Lord Castlereagh. The responsibility was on the mover, and let the House decide fairly; the withdrawing the motion might carry the appearance of mistake in the mover. It might have been more prudent to consult the opinion of the Chair; but the motion being made, he thought the principle of the right ought not to be yielded. This was an attack, not on all public men, but on their corrupt practices; and if defeated in the question now, he hoped it would be brought on again almost immediately. They all knew of these practices, and they had recognized them. The House of Commons had passed over a case proved before them, and the man remained a Minister of State. Does not that transaction shew that abuse is not corrected or checked? and those men who do not wish for a Parliamentary Reform should look well to the remedy of what is practically wrong, and for which Members might be sent to Newgate. A Member offers to prove the existence of Ministerial corruption, and up jumps some honourable Gentleman, and charges him with attacking all public characters, and endeavouring to destroy the Constitution from the foundation, and to build up some new edifice. He denied again the truth of such charges. He saw no proof or just suspicion of such a system as was alluded to. If the House would not give the people the right of public investigation into abuses, the people may be contented and quiet; but they would see, that they who refused enquiry, refused to them the British Constitution."—The case is so clear, that no man can err in deciding upon it. The

cause of the Meetings is to be found *solely* in the existence, the known and acknowledged existence, of abuses, which are so injurious to the people, and the pecuniary pressure and constant difficulties and embarrassments arising from which, are so severely felt. This is the sole cause of the Public Meetings. Nor were the people hasty about it. They waited with great patience to see what the House of Commons would do. But, when they saw a committee of the House sending down *proof*, that a minister of state and a member of the House had been guilty of offering a place of profit to be given for a seat in that House, was it not time for the people to speak their sentiments touching the necessity of a Reform of parliament? And, when they afterwards saw a motion for censuring this member negatived, and the member still keeping his seat and holding his office as a great minister of state, were they still to be silent? Or, if they complained of this, were they to be represented as *anarchists*; as men bent upon the overthrow of the *Constitution*?—The House of Commons, by clearly voting to Mr. Wardle those thanks which he so well deserved, would have prevented any Public Meetings for that purpose; and by now making such a Reform as the necessity of the case so clearly points out, they would prevent future Meetings for that purpose. But, until the people have this Reform, or see the House disposed to make it, they will meet, unless they be prevented, as Mr. Whitbread said, by force; and, in the end, that mode of prevention must be unavailing.

**MR. CURWEN'S MOTION.**—There will, hereafter, be opportunities enough for discussing this question; but, I cannot, even now, refrain from observing, that, if the motion be adopted, I do not see how it can produce any real good. To impose *oaths* upon men *disposed to act corruptly* appears to me to be doing nothing at all. There is no such thing as a minister of state's selling or buying a seat in parliament, even now, without a breach of oath. There would need no oaths at all, if the system of representation was such as to give the voice of election to a sufficient portion of the *property* of the country, and if care was taken to see that the pecuniary qualifications of members were *real* and were to a sufficient amount. There have been instances of men obtaining seats in parliament, in *former times*, at least, in order to screen their bodies from the seizure of a bailiff, and, in fact, in order to

cheat their creditors. Is not this notorious? Well, then, does Mr. Curwen believe; can he possibly believe, that such men would be at all checked by any *oath* that he could devise? Nay, if there were a member, who would give his vote for the sake of getting, or of keeping, a place or a pension, can Mr. Curwen hope, that such a wretch would regard an *oath*? Oh, no! Oaths are made to bind honest men; and an oath of the sort proposed might keep some such out of the House, but not a single rogue, not a single hunter after place or pension; not a single man who would be liable to make use of his seat to the public injury.—What is wanted is precisely that which would render oaths unnecessary.—I do not see any great objection to five or six of the principal servants of the King, who have, every day, statements to make to the House, having seats in it, though I cannot see the necessity of it; but, is it not contrary to all principles of sound reason, that there should be amongst those, whom the constitution considers as a *check* upon the Crown, so large a portion who actually receive the people's money from that Crown, which money they themselves first vote? We, who wish for a Reform, are charged with desiring to *degrade* the House of Commons, when the fact is, that we desire to elevate the character as well of the *electors* as of the *elected*. We wish for nothing new; we wish to recur to the old principles of the constitution, which, indeed, are the dictates of common sense, that *property* should again, as it formerly was, be the basis of *representation*; or, in other words, that those who have interests to manage, should have the choice of the managers. The great alteration, which time has produced, may call for some regulation by which *trade* and *profession* shall be admitted to share with property in land; but still the principle is the same; and, my opinion is, that, unless that principle be acted upon, there will be no Reform worth the paper upon which the act shall be printed.—*Universal suffrage*, though very fair in theory, is good for nothing in practice. They have tried this in America, and the consequence is, that the representatives are pretty much like the worst and most numerous part of the electors, except in the cities, where the whole of the people have an opportunity of being well-informed. The truth is, that there is the same sort of likeness between our present system and that of universal suffrage that exists between Popery and Me-

thodism ; and our electors, those who have the nominal choosing of the far greater part of the members, are of exactly the same description as the most numerous part of the electors in America.

—There is nothing to alarm ; nothing to disturb ; nothing to confuse ; nothing to obstruct the government, in any one of its functions ; there is nothing of this to be apprehended from such a Reform as I have been speaking of ; but, on the contrary, every thing to tranquillize the minds of the people ; to inspire respect for, and confidence in, the parliament ; and to insure, against the attempts of all their enemies, durability to all the establishments of the kingdom.—But, as to an *oath* ! what is an oath ? An oath tendered to those, who are disposed to be dishonest ?

I really cannot, in spite of all my respect for Mr. Curwen, help expressing my surprise that any friend of his country should have thought of it.

Mr. H. MARTYN's motion about *places and pensions* I have not time to notice at any length. Another opportunity will offer. But, it is quite good to see, that Mr. Percival seems to agree, that there is much of waste and abuse in this way ; a thing that he does not appear to have seen before. Oh ! this Mr. Wardle is a wonder-working man ! And, are we still to be told, that he does not merit our thanks.

—My labours, too, in this way, have, it seems, been right, notwithstanding all the abuse, which has been heaped upon them ?

—I, for years, complained of the sale of places under the government. An act is now passing for the avowed purpose of preventing such practices ; and yet the hirelings continue to assault me as a jacobin, who wishes to overturn the government.

—One must not mind this. One must keep on ; never caring what they write or what they say. The country itself is so good, and there are so many good people in it, that one must not be disgusted into supineness by the abuse of the corrupt, the venal, and the ignorant.—When I am accused of democratical principles, I console myself by reflecting, that Dr. O'Meara obtained, through the means of Mrs. Clarke, the occasion of preaching before the king a sermon against democratical principles ; and that his worthy fellow-labourer, John Bowles, was the first man that moulded Anti Jacobinism into a trade.

Botley, 11th May, 1809.

It is with great pleasure, that I see a Meeting of the County of Wilts advertised

for the 17th instant, the requisition to the Sheriff being signed by *ninety-two* Freeholders and other Landholders.—This is the manner in which such things ought to be done.—It shows, that the people take an interest in public matters. There is nothing of party in it. The voice of a set of men, aiming at the possession of power and emolument does not go forth to the world as the voice of a county.

My intention of inserting, at full length, all the Resolutions, &c. passed at the several Meetings, will, I am afraid, be frustrated by the numerousness of them. At any rate, I will insert a *List* of them ; and, if any County or Place should be omitted, I shall be obliged to any gentleman, who will take the trouble to inform me of such omission.

I have great satisfaction, that the editors of the *Portsmouth Telegraph*, of the *Oxford University and City Herald*, and of *Bell's Weekly Messenger*, have intimated to me their readiness to insert the letters, which I purpose to address to the *People of Hampshire*, and which letters will be principally upon the subject of *Parliamentary Reform*.

—Letter I. which appeared in the last Register, will be published in the *Portsmouth Telegraph*.—If any other County, or Weekly Paper, shall choose to publish these letters, I will take care to have copies forwarded to them in time. The editors have only to signify their wish by letter, addressed to *Mr. Wright, No. 5; Paulet Square, London*.—If any of these gentlemen shall differ from me in opinion, they will, of course, state it to their readers. All that I am anxious about is the triumph of truth ; and, in order to secure that triumph, we need nothing but open and free discussion.—I look upon it as a very great compliment from those who have thus expressed their readiness to insert my observations ; and I shall esteem it not the less so, if it should appear that these gentlemen do not agree with me in opinion.

N. B. Owing to a mistake in the printer or the copyist, the Resolution, passed at the *Hampshire Meeting*, thanking those who signed the requisition, the *Sixty-nine* were omitted, leaving nobody to be thanked but Mr. Powlett and myself. I am sure, that no one will suppose that this omission was intentional, and, therefore, I merely state the omission.

#### PROCEEDINGS

In COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &c. relative to the recent INQUIRY in the House

*of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the Duke of York. (Continued from p. 704.)*  
COUNTY OF BERKS.

At a Meeting of the Freeholders and other Inhabitants of the County of Berks, held, at the Town Hall in Reading, in the same County, on Monday, the 17th day of April, 1809, convened by the High Sheriff, in pursuance of a Requisition addressed to him for that purpose.

Resolved, 1. That the recent Investigation into the Conduct of the Commander in Chief, and the result of other late Inquiries, fully satisfy this Meeting of the existence of the most scandalous Abuses in the several Departments of the Executive Government of the Country.

2. That Gwyllim Lloyd Wardle, esq. by his unexampled courage, ability and perseverance in the Inquiry into the Conduct of the Duke of York, has faithfully discharged his duty as a Member of Parliament, and has in a high degree merited the Thanks and Approbation of his Country.

3. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir Fras. Burdett, who seconded Mr. Wardle's Motion; to lord viscount Folkestone, for the active, uniform and able support which he afforded to Mr. Wardle during the whole of the above Inquiry; to Charles Shaw Lefevre, William Lewis Hughes, and George Knapp, esqrs. (Members representing Boroughs within this County); and to the remainder of the 125 Members who divided with Mr. Wardle on his Motion for an Address to his Majesty—in full confidence that they will persevere in the investigation and reform of abuses, till corruption be fully rooted out, and the people have the satisfaction of knowing that the sacrifices they make for the public good are not perverted to base and improper purposes.

4. That this Meeting is convinced, that the abuses which we lament would not so long have existed, without that culpable negligence and dereliction of duty which the late Majorities in the House of Commons have evinced.

5. That in order to secure in future a due vigilance and attention to the rights and interests of the people, so essential to the welfare of a free Government, it is requisite that the duration of Parliaments should be shortened, and that no Parliament should have any continuance longer than for three years, as enacted by a law passed in the reign of king William the Third.

6. That George Vansittart, esq. Repre-

sentative of this County, has by his conduct on the late Inquiry, proved himself unworthy of the confidence of his Constituents.

7. That the conduct of Charles Dundas, esq. Representative of this County, on the late Inquiry, has not in this instance met with the approbation of his Constituents.

8. That from the part which Ministers have taken on the late Inquiry, no hope can be reasonably entertained of any effectual reformation of evils so generally and loudly complained of, until the Executive Department of the State shall be entrusted to men, who will honestly endeavour to detect, not shield abuses, and to whom the people may look up as the avengers, not the abettors of corruption.

9. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir John Throckmorton, bart. William Hallet, esq. and the other Gentlemen who have brought forward these Resolutions, and for their able support of the same.

#### TOWN OF NORTHAMPTON.

The Mayor having declined to accede to a Requisition, signed by seventeen respectable Householders, to call a Meeting of the Inhabitants of this Town, to take into consideration the propriety of thanking Gwyllim Lloyd Wardle, esq., M. P. for his recent patriotic exertions in Parliament respecting the conduct of the late Commander in Chief, a numerous and respectable Meeting of the Inhabitants was held April 17th, pursuant to public advertisement, at the Angel Inn, when, for want of room, the company adjourned to the Yard, and the following Resolutions were then proposed and agreed to, viz.

1. Resolved unanimously,—That the sincere and cordial Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq., M. P. for Oakhampton, in the county of Devon, for his manly, independent and patriotic exertions, in instituting and conducting the Charges against the late Commander in Chief.

2. Resolved unanimously,—That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir Francis Burdett, bart., for having seconded the Motion of Mr. Wardle.

3. Resolved unanimously,—That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to lord visc. Althorp, one of the Representatives of this County, for his public-spirited conduct during the late Investigation, and particularly for his Constitutional Speech with which he prefaced the Amendment to Mr. Bragge Bathurst's Motion.

4. Resolved unanimously,—That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the 125 Independent Members, who decided in favour of Mr. Wardle's Motion for an Address to the King on the subject of the late Inquiry.

5. Resolved (with only six dissentients),—That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that the gross and scandalous Abuses that have recently been exposed and detected, call loudly for Constitutional Redress and Correction as the only means left to convince the People, that the heavy Sacrifices they are called upon to make are not perverted to base and improper purposes.

6. Resolved unanimously,—That the Proceedings of this Meeting be signed by the Chairman, and that copies thereof be sent to G. L. Wardle, esq.; sir Francis Burdett, bart.; and lord visc. Althorp; and that the same be published in the Northampton Mercury, the County Press, the Morning Chronicle, the Courier, and the Star newspapers.

#### BOROUGH OF DERBY.

At a General Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Borough of Derby, at the Town Hall, on the 18th April, convened by the Mayor, pursuant to a Requisition, “to consider the propriety of returning ‘Thanks to Gwyllim Lloyd Wardle, esq., for having instituted and prosecuted ‘the late Inquiry into the Conduct of his ‘Royal Highness the Duke of York,’ H. Browne, esq., Mayor, in the Chair, The following Resolutions were almost unanimously adopted, viz.

That this Meeting, actuated by the purest motives, is desirous of expressing to G. L. Wardle, esq., its grateful Thanks for the firm and independent manner in which, unconnected with party, he instituted, and the temper and perseverance which he displayed, in the prosecution of the late arduous Inquiry into the Conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York.

That this Meeting, believing that gross abuses and shameful corruption have been fully proved to exist in various departments of the State, and in the general administration of public affairs, is thoroughly convinced of the necessity of timely and temperate, but strict and effectual inquiry and correction.

That after the distinguished proof which has been given by Mr. Wardle, of what under the forms of our excellent Constitution may be accomplished by the honest exertions of an individual Member of the

House of Commons, this Meeting trusts that the fatal consequences to which such corruption and abuse must inevitably lead, will be averted by the united efforts of all good men, and of such Representatives of the People in particular, as with abilities equal to the task, shall have the courage, probity, and independence, to step forwards on an occasion so pregnant with honour to themselves and safety to their country.

That a Copy of these Resolutions be signed by the Chairman, and transmitted by him to G. L. Wardle, esq.

#### BOROUGH OF LEWES.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of the said Borough, holden at the Town Hall, in Lewes, on Tuesday the 18th day of April, 1809, in conformity to a Requisition signed by a great number of the Inhabitants,—Mr. HENRY PAWSON, Senior Constable, in the Chair,

Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq., for his patriotic and firm conduct in preferring and prosecuting certain Charges of corrupt practices against his Royal Highness the Duke of York, in his Office of Commander in Chief.

Resolved unanimously, That in the opinion of this Meeting the evidence adduced before the House of Commons, fully proved abuses to have existed with the knowledge of his Royal Highness, to the great detriment of the Army, and which must, if persevered in, have been ultimately injurious to the best and dearest interests of the nation at large.

Resolved, That this Meeting feels great mortification that the House of Commons (notwithstanding the Resignation of his Royal Highness the Commander in Chief), did not place upon their Journals some Resolution that should have recorded their sense of his misconduct, and which might have been handed down to posterity as a valuable lesson of reproof; and that this Meeting cannot fail to observe, that the conduct of the Majority of the House of Commons during the whole of the late proceedings, has but added one more to the many instances that might be adduced, in which similar Majorities appear to have acted under an influence directly opposed to the feelings and opinions of the People.

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that the Representatives who cease to feel a common interest with the people on the subject of abuses, can afford no security to the people against the increase of those abuses; and that therefore

the only effectual remedy which can be applied to so great and alarming an evil, is such a Reform in the Election of Representatives as will enable them sufficiently to speak the sentiments of the people.

Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Thomas Kemp and Henry Shelley, esquires, the Independent Representatives of this Independent Borough, for their steady and uniform conduct in voting in the Minority upon each motion, that tended to censure his Royal Highness the Commander in Chief.

Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be also given to sir F. Burdett, bart., the Seconder; to lord Folkestone, Mr. Whitbread, sir S. Romilly, adm. Markham, gen. Ferguson, Mr. H. Martin, Mr. Coke, and Mr. C. W. Wynne, who so ably supported it; to those Members who represent places in this county, and the rest of the 125 Representatives who formed the Independent Minority on the important question produced by Mr. Wardle's motion.

Resolved unanimously, That the Constables be requested to transmit a copy of these Resolutions to G. L. Wardle, Thos. Kemp, and Henry Shelley, esquires.

#### BOROUGH OF READING.

At a very numerous and respectable Meeting of the Inhabitants of this Borough, convened by the Worshipful THOMAS GLEED, esq., Mayor of the said Borough, in pursuance of a Requisition to consider of the corrupt practices lately proved in the House of Commons, and holden in the Town-hall the 19th instant, the twelve following Resolutions having been moved by J. B. Monck, esq., and seconded by H. Marsh, esq., were carried as follows:—

1st, Resolved unanimously, That corrupt practices have been found to exist in the grant of Commissions and Appointments in the Army, no less disgraceful to the character of the late Commander in Chief as a Soldier, than ruinous to the Public Service.

2ndly, Unanimously, That G. L. Wardle, esq., is entitled to the Thanks of his Country, for the zeal, integrity and intrepidity, with which he maintained the Charges of Corruption brought against his Royal Highness the Duke of York, in spite of the luke-warmness of the leading Members of Opposition, and the open hostility and direct menaces of Ministers.

3rdly, (With only one Dissident), That Charles Shaw Lefevre, esq., one of the Representatives for this Borough, has

deserved well of his Constituents, and conferred honour on their choice, by the plain, intelligible, independent, consistent, decisive manner in which he acted and voted during the whole course of the late Inquiry.

4th, Unanimously, That our Thanks are due to sir F. Burdett, bart., who seconded Mr. Wardle; lord vise. Folkestone; sir S. Romilly, kn>t.; S. Whitbread, esq.; adm. Markham; the gallant gen. Ferguson, and the remainder of the 125 Members who supported Mr. Wardle's Motion.

5th, (With only three Dissentients), That the Vote of the House of Commons upon the Motion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the Acquittal of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, from all knowledge of the corrupt practices proved, hath done violence both to the understanding and feelings of Englishmen, and affords a prominent and striking example of the very imperfect Representation of the People.

6th, Unanimously, That the only effectual barrier against the inroads of Corruption is to be found in the constitutional resort to obtain a fair and faithful Representation of the People in their House of Commons.

7th, (With only one Dissident), That the number of Placemen and Pensioners having seats in the House of Commons is a growing evil, contrary to an ancient Resolution of that House, destructive of the Independence of Parliament, and that the number ought to be restricted to certain Officers of State, whose presence may be expedient in the House of Commons.

8th, Unanimously, That the state of the decayed Boroughs in the United Kingdom, returning Members to Parliament, and which have become by lapse of time the private property of individuals, is one great cause of the present wide extending deplorable Corruption, and demands the serious attention of Parliament, as a mockery of Representation.

9th, (With only three Dissentients), That the restoration of triennial Parliaments agreeable to the Statute 6th William and Mary, would greatly check Corruption, and in the words of the Preamble to that memorable Act, would “tend very much to the happy union and good agreement of the King and People.”

10th, Unanimously, That the only way to have independent men in Parliament, is to send them independent there, and that the example set by Westminster

in the manner of electing sir F. Burdett, cannot be too highly commended, and is worthy to be imitated by all the free Boroughs throughout the Kingdom.

11th, (With only three Dissentients). That during the present reign every successive Administration has yielded either to the force or to the temptation of the present system of Corruption, and the result of every change has been to hold the People in delusion, and not to remove, but perpetuate Abuses.

12th, (With only five Dissentients). That we have no hopes that his Majesty's present Ministers will ever seriously and earnestly take in hand the work of Reformation, as the late proceedings in Parliament have fully proved them to be the Ministers of the Crown only, and not of the People—the Stiflers of Inquiry and the Abettors of Corruption.

A Resolution being then put by the Rev. Dr. Valpy, and seconded by Rob. Harris, esq.; that the vote of John Simeon, esq.; one of the Representatives of this Borough, in favour of Mr. Bankes's Motion, is highly deserving of the thanks of his Constituents—was negatived by a great Majority.

A Resolution was then proposed by the rev. Dr. Valpy, and seconded by Thomas Ring, esq., "That in order to set the example of Purity of Representation, it is unfit for any Elector of this Borough to accept a Public Dinner or any other Gratuity, directly or indirectly, from his Representatives," which was carried without opposition.

#### TOWN OF KINGSTON-UPON HULL.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Town and Neighbourhood of Kingston-upon Hull, held at the Guild-hall there on Wednesday, the 19th instant, for the purpose of expressing their public Opinion of the Transactions which have recently passed in the House of Commons, and to consider of a Vote of Thanks to Mr. Wardle, (along with the other Members who supported him) for the manly intrepidity and perseverance displayed by him in instituting and prosecuting his charges against the conduct of the Ex-Commander in Chief.—Andrew Hollingworth, esq. Mayor, in the chair.

Resolved unanimously,

That it is the duty of this Meeting to express their detestation of the corrupt practices proved to exist in the Military Administration of the country, and in various other departments of Government.

That G. L. Wardle, esq. by his intrep-

dity in preferring charges of corruption against his Royal Highness the late Commander-in-Chief, and by his ability and perseverance in establishing the same, is eminently entitled to the Thanks of this Meeting, and to the everlasting gratitude of his country.

That the Thanks of this Meeting are also due to lord vise. Mahon and John Staniforth, esq. our Representatives in Parliament, to Tho. Thompson, esq. our fellow townsmen, and to lord vise. Milton, and William Wilberforce, esq. the Representatives for the County of York, together with the rest of the Independent Minority, for their votes and exertions on this occasion.

That this Meeting, seeing the shameful venality that prevails in the different departments of the State, and also as has been recently evinced, in the disposal of East India patronage, feels it a duty to state their conviction of the necessity of a complete Change of public measures, of the Abolition of Reversionary Grants and unmerited Pensions and Sinecure Places, and of the Restoration of the Purity of Parliament, according to the genuine principles of the Constitution.

That the Chairman be requested to sign these Resolutions as the act of this Meeting, and to transmit copies thereof to Mr. Wardle, lord Mahon, Mr. Staniforth, Mr. Thompson, lord Milton, and Mr. Wilberforce.

#### BOROUGH OF STAFFORD.

At a General Meeting of the Inhabitants of this Borough, convened by public advertisement, April 26th, the following Address was unanimously voted to G. L. Wardle, esq.

To G. L. Wardle, esq.—We the Inhabitants of the Borough of Stafford, have witnessed with sentiments of admiration and gratitude, the firm but temperate manner, in which you have prosecuted a long and laborious inquiry into the conduct of the late Commander in Chief.—The victory which you have obtained over the abuses disclosed in that high official situation, is a noble instance of the self-renovating power of our glorious constitution.—You have shewn, that any virtuous and independent Member of the House of Commons, unconnected with party, but supported by the public voice, is enabled to promote the cause of truth and the real interests of the nation.—Estimating your services therefore as the efforts of an honest and courageous mind, we offer to you

our ardent thanks, as a part of that community which you have so eminently benefited.

Resolved, that a copy of this Address, signed by the Chairman, be transmitted by him to G. L. Wardle, esq.

#### TOWN AND COUNTY OF POOLE.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Town and County of Poole, pursuant to Public Notice, held at the Town Hall, on Friday, the 21st of April, 1809, Thomas Parr, in the Chair.

Resolved, That the exposure of many transactions in the several Departments of the State, and the conduct of many persons connected therewith, are so many melancholy proofs that the Constitution of the Country has been endangered by gross and scandalous corruption.

That it is the indispensable duty of every Member of the House of Commons, to guard with a watchful eye the expenditure of the public money; and as the faithful guardian of the People's rights, to exert every endeavour to detect, and bring to condign punishment, the Agents of Corruption in every Department of the State.

That it is to the true patriotism and undaunted zeal of G. L. Wardle, esq. that the Country is indebted for the exposure of many flagrant abuses in the Military Department; and to his unexampled courage and perseverance, (assisted by the virtuous and independent Members of the House of Commons) we look with confidence to the completion of the great work of Reformation. Deeply impressed with these sentiments, we cannot but consider G. L. Wardle, esq. intitled not only to our warmest Thanks, but also to the gratitude of his country.

That the Thanks of this Meeting be conveyed to G. L. Wardle, esq. accordingly.

That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to B. Lester Lester, esq. the worthy Representative of this Town and County; to the Member for the County of Dorset, and to all other the Members of the House of Commons who voted in the different Minorities on the late important questions.

#### TOWN OF MAIDSTONE.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of this Town, held at the Court Hall, pursuant to public notice, April 21, James Smyth, esq.

in the Chair, The following Resolutions were entered into:—

1. Resolved unanimously, That the late Inquiry by the House of Commons into the Conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, as Commander-in-Chief, has exposed the most flagrant abuses in the Administration of Public Affairs, which tend to stain the honour of the British character and endanger the security of the Empire.

2. Unanimously, That impressed with a deep sense of the service he has rendered his country, the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq. for that diligent perseverance and temperate, but manly spirit, with which, undismayed by the menaces of power, or unsupported by the intrigues of party, he has brought into public view a system of corruption, equally dangerous to the Liberties of the People, and the Safety of the Crown.

3. Unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir F. Burdett, bart. for having seconded Mr. Wardle's Motion.

4. Unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be presented to Geo. Longman, esq. our worthy Representative, for the faithful discharge of his public trust, in opposing abuse and corruption by voting in favour of Mr. Wardle's Motion.

5. Unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to lord Folkestone, W. Honywood, esq. S. Whitbread, esq. sir S. Romilly, kn. gen. Ferguson, J. Calcraft, esq. J. Jackson, esq. and the rest of the 125 Honest Members, who voted for Mr. Wardle's Motion.

6. Unanimously, That the decision of the Majority of the House of Commons on the Abuses brought to light in the course of the late Inquiry, is a subject of deep regret and concern to the People of England, and must impress conviction on the mind of every Friend to his King and Country that a radical Reform in the Representation of the People presents the only effectual means of putting a stop to those corrupt practices which undermine and threaten to destroy our envied Constitution.

7. With three dissentient voices, That this Hall is gratified to hear that the respectable names of sir Wm. Geary, bart. T. Law Hodges, esq. and T. Rider, esq. are given to a Meeting, called for the express purpose of digesting a plan of a Reform in Parliament, and we trust that their efforts will conduce to the satisfaction of the People, and the welfare of the Country.

## BOROUGH OF PLYMOUTH.

At a very numerous and respectable Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Borough of Plymouth, convened at the Guildhall thereof this 24th day of April, 1809, by public Advertisement, by the Worshipful the Mayor, to consider the propriety of a Vote of Thanks to Mr. Wardle, for his exemplary and judicious arrangements, in a recent Investigation before Parliament respecting the Conduct of the late Commander in Chief of the Army.—The Worshipful the Mayor in the Chair.

Resolved, That circumstances of public notoriety place beyond all doubt the long existence of nefarious and scandalous Abuses in various Branches of the Government of the Country, and that minute Investigation is absolutely necessary into several Public Departments,

Resolved, That G. L. Wardle, esq. has faithfully discharged the duties of a conscientious Member of Parliament, and is eminently entitled to the approbation and thanks of the Inhabitants of this Town, for the firm and manly manner and distinguished abilities evinced by him on the Inquiry into the Conduct of the late Commander in Chief of the Army; and also that great praise is due to all those who supported him in his arduous and difficult undertaking.

Resolved, That the Inhabitants of this Town regret that a much greater number of independent and unbiased Members were not to be found in the House of Commons anxious to promote such measures as might tend to annihilate Corruption, which if not corrected must endanger the welfare of our inestimable and happy Constitution.

Resolved, That the Mayor be requested to communicate to G. L. Wardle, esq. the Sentiments and Resolutions of this Meeting.

## CITY OF COVENTRY.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of this City, held at the County Hall, the 25th day of April, 1809, pursuant to notice given by Basil Goode, esq. Mayor, in consequence of a Requisition sent to him, for the purpose of expressing their sentiments upon the late Investigation of the Conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, before the House of Commons; which was

as respectfully and numerously attended as any Public Meeting ever witnessed in that Hall.—Samuel Whitwell, esq. in the Chair.

After some preliminary observations, from several Gentlemen, explanatory of the nature and design of the Meeting, the following Resolutions were passed without one dissenting voice:

1. That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that corrupt abuses appear to have existed to an alarming extent, in different departments of the State, and particularly in that of the Army, as clearly substantiated by the evidence produced before the House of Commons, in the Investigation of the Conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York, the late Commander in Chief.

2. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq. M. P. for his intrepid and patriotic conduct in bringing forward the Charges before the House of Commons, and for his laudable and persevering exertions, in the face of the most powerful opposition, during the progress of this arduous business.

3. That the Thanks of this Meeting be also given to our worthy Representatives, Peter Moore, esq. and William Mills, esq. for their independent conduct during this important Investigation, and for which they are justly entitled to the additional approbation and confidence of their Constituents.

4. That the Thanks of this Meeting be also given to sir Francis Burdett, bart. M. P. lord vise. Folkestone, M. P. Samuel Whitbread, esq. M. P. sir Samuel Romilly, knt. M. P. major-general Ferguson, M. P. Harvey Christian Combe, esq. M. P. and all the rest of the virtuous and honourable Minorities, who nobly stood forth at this important crisis as the enemies of corruption and the friends of their country, by supporting Mr. Wardle upon this occasion.

5. That this Meeting consider the conduct of the present administration, relative to the late Inquiry respecting his Royal Highness the Duke of York, derogatory to their official duty, and renders them altogether undeserving that great trust with which they are invested.

6. That a Committee be appointed to carry these Resolutions into effect, and that it consist of those Gentlemen who signed the Requisition.

(To be continued.)

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 20.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 20, 1809.

[Price 1s.

"MY lords, I think it is due to the age and country in which we live, to state what, indeed, is universally believed, that there never was a period in the history of this country, or of any other, in which the characters of persons, in an exalted station of public life, were so free from all suspicion of this species of offence (*corruption*) as at the present moment."—MR. PERCEVAL'S Speech on the Trial of Philip Hamlin, 22nd Nov. 1802.

737] [738

## MR. MADOCKS'S MOTION.

THE Debate upon Mr. Wardle's introduction of his Charges I thought so very important, so necessary to be read by every one, and to be speedily put into a situation, where it might be easily referred to, that I deviated from my usual practice, and inserted the whole of the Report of it in the Register, as that report stood in the news-papers.—If there was good reason for doing so, upon that occasion, how much stronger is the reason for it in the present instance! The charge then was, in every point of view, of trifling consequence; indeed of no consequence at all; of a sort not worthy of a moment's attention, compared to the Charge brought forward by MR. MADOCKS, on the 11th of this month; and the Debate upon which is infinitely more interesting to us, than the fate of any, or of all the nations upon the continent of Europe, and of all the colonial possessions and commerce in the whole world. In short, after years and years of disputation, relative to the means by which men get to be Members of Parliament; after hundreds of prosecutions against those, who have, at different times, written and published relative to those means; at last, MR. MADOCKS has brought the

thing to a point; indeed to an issue; aye to a clear and unequivocal decision.—This Debate, therefore, is, beyond all comparison, the most important that I have ever had any knowledge of. It will, I hope, be read by every man that can read, in this whole kingdom. Those who take in papers containing it, should lend them to their neighbours, who do not. It should, if possible, be got by heart; and repeated once every week, in every family in the kingdom. Boys at school should have it to read, in preference to every other thing. It should be printed in all shapes and sizes; and be perpetuated in all the ways in which any act, or event, can be perpetuated. A concise statement of the charge and the decision should have a place in all the *Almanacks*; all the printed *Memorandum Books*; in *Court Kalendars*; *Books of Roads*; and, I see no harm in its having a place upon a spare leaf in the *Books of Common Prayer*. It should be framed and glazed; and hung up in Inns, Town-Halls, Courts of Justice, Market-Places, and, in short, the eye of every human creature should be, if possible, constantly fixed upon it.—I mean merely the naked fact: The bare record, unaccompanied with any comment whatever.—Nor shall I, upon this

occasion, or any other, that I can at present foresee, offer any *comment*, or *opinion*, upon any part of this Debate, as far, at least, as it relates to the Charge. I shall take it, word for word, and letter for letter, as I find it reported in the MORNING CHRONICLE newspaper of the 12th instant, and shall leave the reader to form his own opinion. He will, indeed, need no opinion of mine. The thing will speak for itself. It is plain matter of fact, unencumbered with any thing that can give rise to a difference to be settled by reasoning. The Charge, as will be seen below, in Mr. Madocks own words, was this :—“I affirm, then, that Mr. Dick purchased a seat in the House of Commons for the borough of Cashel, through the agency of the Honourable Henry Wellesley, who acted for, and on behalf of, the Treasury ; that, upon a recent question of the last importance, when Mr. Dick had determined to vote according to his conscience, the noble Lord, CASTLEREAGH, did intimate to that gentleman the necessity of either his voting with the government, or resigning his seat in that House ; and that Mr. Dick, sooner than vote against principle, did make choice of the latter alternative, and vacate his seat accordingly. To this transaction I charge the Right Honourable Gentleman, MR. PERCEVAL, as being privy and having committed at it. This I will ENGAGE TO PROVE BY WITNESSES AT YOUR BAR, if the House will give me leave to call them.”—At the end of the Debate, which en-

sued upon this, the question was taken upon a motion FOR AN INQUIRY into the matter; there appears, from the report, to have been 395 members present ; and, out of the 395, 85 voted for the motion, which, of course, was lost, there being three hundred and ten out of three hundred and ninety five, who voted *against the inquiry*—Such was the *charge*, and such the *result*: and now the reader has nothing to do, but carefully to peruse, and tenaciously to keep in mind, what was said upon both sides of this question : this interesting, this great, this all-important question ; this question, which involves in it consequences of ten million times more importance to England, than the fate of all the expeditions, all the armies, and all the fleets in the world.

### REPORT OF THE DEBATE, IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

*On the 11th of May, 1809, upon the Charge made by Mr. MADOCKS, against Mr. PERCEVAL and Lord CASTLEREAGH, relative to the selling of a Seat in Parliament to Mr. Dick, and to the influence exercised with Mr. Dick, as to his voting upon the recent important question.*

MR. MADOCKS began by moving that the Resolution of that House on the 10th Dec. 1779, be then read—it was read accordingly, and stated in substance, that it is “Highly criminal for any Minister or Ministers, or any other Servant of the Crown in Great Britain, directly or indirectly, to make use of the power of his office, in order to influence the election of Members of Parliament, and that an attempt to exercise that influence was an attack upon the dignity, the honour and the independence of Parlia-

"ment, an infringement of the rights and  
"the liberties of the people, and an attempt  
"to sap the basis of our free and happy Constitu-  
"tion."—Mr. Madocks next moved the Resolution of that House on the 25th April, 1809, be then read—it was read accordingly, and alledged in substance, "That while it was the bounden duty of that House to maintain at all times a jealous guard upon its purity, and not to suffer any attempt upon its privileges to pass unnoticed, the attempt in the present instance (that of Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Reding), not having been carried into effect, that House did not think it then necessary to proceed to any criminal Resolutions respecting the same."

—Mr. Madocks then said, that before he proceeded to redeem the pledge he had given to the House of bringing forward the Charges he had that day to adduce, he thought it right to remind them of the opinion they had recorded of that criminal conduct, of which he then rose to accuse two of their own body. Before he entered directly into the statement of his Charge, he trusted that the indulgence of the House would allow him to make a few preliminary observations, arising out of and bearing upon the subject. In his attempt at that time to discharge his duty, he hoped that he would discharge it in a manner that became his sense of it; and in the first place, he was most anxious to abstain from every thing personal, from any thing that could give pretence for an imputation of the kind—for he could in truth say, that no such charge could be justly imputed to him. He was influenced by no personal motives, it was to measures he looked, not to individuals. He entirely overlooked the Men in the System—a system which seemed to say, that corruption was necessary to govern Englishmen—a system, which seemed to say that the English Constitution was inadequate without the aid of corruption to the purposes of good government, was insufficient without corruption for social order, foreign relations, or self-defence.

—He denied, in the name of the Constitution, the necessity of such a system, and thought that any attempt to argue its necessity was one of the strongest proofs of its dangerous and fatal tendency. It was against such a system his hostility was directed, and when he stood forth in that House the avowed enemy of corruption, he felt he had a right to claim the alliance of the hon. gentlemen opposite in the same cause, who had recently stated

that if instances of corruption did exist, it was the duty of the House to hunt them out, and drag them to light. In that feeling he shared with those hon. gentlemen, and trusted that the indignation they seemed to express at the theory of corruption would not be allayed by an exposition of the practice. He for his part, was no party man—he was bound to no man, or any set of men, except as far as he agreed with those who were anxious for the extirpation of corruption and abuses of every kind, and the restoration, in their original purity, of all the good and sound old principles of the Constitution. This was what he looked for, and what, if the House and the country were true to themselves, he did not yet despair of attaining. It was a favourite opinion with some of the rt. hon. gentlemen, that no times were less corrupt than the present—that this was, as it were, the age of purity. If such an opinion was well founded, it would be rather inconsistent with such an opinion, and not very conformable to the spirit of such times, to resort to any party expedient, in order to resist or to evade any direct charge of corruption against any individual whatever. Gentlemen, therefore, who thought so purely of present times, and public men, would no doubt, with a suitable jealousy, insist upon every charge of corruption being directly met, minutely examined into, and impartially decided upon. Upon a former night he had been accused of having been guilty of a violation of the usual courtesy of that House, in not having given the customary notice to the hon. gentlemen particularly interested in the charges he had to bring forward. To this he could only reply, by reminding the House that two or three years ago, when a Member of that House (Mr. Ashton Smith) presented the Hampshire Petition, it was objected by the gentleman charged with undue interference in the Southampton election, (Mr. Freemantle), and complained of by his friends, that no notice whatever had been given that gent. of the charge to be preferred against him—but it was at the same time contended by those now composing his Majesty's Government, that the Petition should be received, and that the allegations contained in it should be brought under the special consideration of the house. In that opinion the House concurred; thinking then, as he hoped they would now, that where the charge was of so serious nature, involving the paramount question of their own privileges, it would not become their dignity

or their justice to suffer themselves to be led away from so great an object by any light objection to mere introductory informations. He did not wish to take any hon. gent. by surprise, nor was the charge he had to bring forward calculated to do so. It was a charge that the moment it was heard might be rebutted by an innocent man, unless it would be contended that there were degrees of corruption now so sanctioned by prescription, that that House must necessarily connive at them. He was of an opposite opinion—an opinion founded upon the history of better times. In the whole course of the history of England he no where found that Sinecure Places and Offices, and Rotten Boroughs, were to be considered and venerated as comprising the *palladium* of England. He read no where that the constitution was only to be preserved by the preservation of its abuses. He rather believed that it would be best secured by rooting out such abuses; and that the spirit in which a memorable attack upon corruption had originated with an hon. friend below him (Mr. Whitbread), and in which another had been conducted so lately by his hon. friend, (Mr. Wardle), was the best stay to which the constitution could look for safety and support. Serious as the charges were which had been brought in both the instances he alluded to, they were comparatively trifling, when considered in relation to that most flagitious of all abuses, by which the influence of the Treasury was exerted in returning Members to that House. In the good old times of the country, the crime was looked upon in its proper light—it was considered as fraught with the most dreadful consequences. In 1734, sir John St. Aubin declared in that House that such a system alone could give the last fatal blow to the liberties of the country, and that if the Treasury governed that House, the popular part of the constitution was gone for ever—that the people might continue to exist, but that the doors of that House would be effectually closed against their wishes and their wants. But he would read to the House the passage. “—For if a Minister should ever gain a “corrupt familiarity with our Boroughs, “if he should keep a register of them in “his closet, and by sending down his “Treasury mandates, should procure a “spurious representation of the people, “the offspring of his corruption, who will “be at all times ready to reconcile and “justify the most contradictory measures “of his administration—if the mainten-

“ance of his power should become the “sole object of their attention, and they “should be guilty of the most violent “breach of Parliamentary trust, by giving “the King a discretionary liberty of taxing “the people without limitation or “controul, the last fatal compliment they “can pay the Crown—if this should ever “be the unhappy circumstance of this nation, the people indeed may complain, “but the doors of that place where their “complaints should be heard will be for “ever shut against them. Let country “gentlemen, by having frequent opportunities of exerting themselves, be “kept active in their contention for the “public good, this will raise that zeal “and indignation, which will at last get “the better of those undue influences, by “which the Officers of the Crown, though “unknown to the several Boroughs, have “been able to supplant country gentlemen “of great character and fortune, “who live in their neighbourhood.”—The nature of that influence branched out into so many and various ways of misappropriating the money taken out of the pockets of the people, that it was impossible to have an adequate idea of its magnitude and danger, or to be too vigilant in retrenching the one and guarding against the other. He had already signified his intention of taking an early opportunity of submitting to the consideration of the House the present state of certain boroughs in England. He trusted that the statement he should then submit to the House would induce them to a revision of the entire system of boroughs. He should take the liberty of advertizing at present to one or two instances of this Borough influence. The first was the borough of Hastings, which consisted of only fourteen voters. The right of election being in the Corporation. This borough was the property of Mr. Millwood and his Son, who were agents for Government, and were the mayor of the town alternately. The younger Mr. Millwood was comptroller of the excise, with a salary of 1,425*l.* per annum, a place which was nearly, if not quite, a sinecure, though by the 5th of William and Mary, chapter the 30th, collectors and officers in the excise were interdicted from any interference in elections. If the sum of 1,425*l.* be multiplied by seven, it would be found that it cost the People for every Parliament 9,975*l.*—With respect to the borough of Rye there were but six electors. Mr. Thomas Lamb was agent for the Treasury, and

this gentleman was in the enjoyment of the lucrative situation of Tally-cutter, another in the Exchequer, and was also curitor of Hampshire. This borough was under similar restrictions as the last mentioned borough of Hastings.—The next borough he should advert to was that of Cambridge. Here the agent for Government was Mr. John Mordake, a banker, and resident at Cambridge. This gentleman was receiver-general of the Post-Office, with a salary of 800*l.* per annum, and had a deputy, a Mr. Bowden, at a salary of 500*l.* a year, though by the 9th Anne, chapter 10th, officers of the Post-Office were prohibited from interfering in elections.—The next borough he should mention was that of Queenborough. The influence of this borough was divided between the Ordnance and the Admiralty. The amount of the salaries of the places held by the freemen of the borough under the Ordnance and the Navy Boards was annually 2,368*l.* So that the public money paid to the electors of Queenborough, during a Parliament of seven years or sessions, independent of other sorts of influence, amounted to no less a sum than 14,576*l.* Not to mention that the boroughs of Westbury and New Romney were openly sold for money.—But of all the various corruptions and abuses—of all the fatal misapplications of the public money, none, he thought, so imperatively called for an immediate check as the corrupt interference to which he had already alluded, exercised by the Treasury, to procure the return of Members to that House.—This, continued Mr. Madocks, is poisoning the fountain of health. The only quarter to which we can look for the prevention or redress of other corruption. What, Sir, can be more fatal than to suffer any thing to vitiate the legislative, inquisitorial, and remedial branches of the Constitution? It has been always held, in all periods of our history, that any corruption practised by individuals to obtain seats in this House, is an offence against the Constitution, and laws have from time to time been enacted conformably to that principle; but for the Executive Power to attempt to corrupt the Legislative, has been considered as most fatal, and your Journals and Resolutions proclaim the enormity of such offence in the eye of the Constitution. Treasury influence, from the various shapes it assumes, may, in its nature, be divided into several classes—but that the most alarming and obnoxious is where public money is made instru-

mental to the return of Members to this House, either by actually buying or selling seats with money, or by applying annually part of the taxes taken out of the pockets of the people towards the keeping up a corrupt influence in the boroughs which return Members at the nomination of the Treasury, while those Members again pay a certain sum of money to the Treasury for their seats, which money is carried to a certain fund, and then doled out to carry elections in other places.—But, Sir, having enumerated these cases, which, in my opinion, ought to be submitted to a Committee to examine, sift, and regulate, I now come, Sir, to a case of what I consider as aggravated in the extreme, and one that calls for an immediate investigation at your Bar. I mean, Sir, the case of the Borough of Cashel in Ireland, in all the transactions relating to which at the last General Election, and since that time, it will be found that the Treasury have conducted themselves not only directly in the teeth of your Resolutions, but have exercised an influence beyond all parallel, and have not only violated the constitution in the most unequivocal manner, but, have inflicted signal injustice on a most honourable individual, because he had too strict a sense of propriety to vote against his conscience, and what he felt to be his right line of duty. The conduct of the hon. gent. to whom I allude, has in this instance been so strikingly correct, manly and upright, that I am confident he will meet with, as he is entitled to, the esteem of every honest man. This is not an inchoate or unfinished act. Sir, it is to this case that, for the present, I propose to call the particular attention of the House, and to conclude with a motion for hearing evidence at the Bar, in support of the statement, the facts of which I am fully prepared to prove. I have so far departed from the proceeding of the other night, though I cannot, on a revision of the precedent, find that I am not fully justified in such a course. I AFFIRM THEN, THAT MR. DICK PURCHASED A SEAT IN THIS HOUSE FOR THE BOROUGH OF CASHEL, THROUGH THE AGENCY OF THE HONOURABLE HENRY WELLESLEY, WHO ACTED FOR AND ON BEHALF OF THE TREASURY; THAT UPON A RECENT QUESTION OF THE LAST IMPORTANCE, WHEN MR. DICK HAD DETERMINED TO VOTE ACCORDING TO HIS CONSCIENCE, THE NOBLE LORD (CASTLEREAGH) DID INTIMATE TO THAT GENTLEMAN, THE NECESSITY OF EITHER HIS VOTING WITH THE GOVERNMENT, OR RESIGNING HIS SEAT IN THAT HOUSE; AND THAT MR. DICK, SOONER THAN VOTE AGAINST

PRINCIPLE, DID MAKE CHOICE OF THE LATTER ALTERNATIVE, AND DID VACATE HIS SEAT ACCORDINGLY—TO THIS TRANSACTION I CHARGE THE RIGHT HONOURABLE GENTLEMAN (MR. PERCEVAL), AS BEING PRIVY AND HAVING CONNIVED AT IT; THIS I WILL ENGAGE TO PROVE BY WITNESSES AT YOUR BAR, if the House will give me leave to call them—if the House will permit me to do so, I am satisfied that they could not take a more direct method to remedy the abuses in the Representative System of such places as Hastings, Rye, Cambridge, Queenborough, and many other places that could be mentioned, where large annual sums were paid out of the taxes, in the maintenance of Sinecure Offices and Places to uphold the influence of the Treasury in such Boroughs.—I shall now, Sir, detain you no longer, than by again asserting the purity of my motives. They originate in my aversion to such practices, which, (to use the concluding language of the ever-memorable Hampshire Petition), with all due deference to the superior wisdom of the House, I venture to describe as calculated to bring into discredit the Government of the country, and to shake the confidence of the people in the honour and independence of the House of Commons.—I have, therefore, like the Petitioners, "felt it my "bounden duty, not only to my constituents, "and to my fellow-subjects, but especially to the House, to bring under "their notice these outrages, as I deem "them, against the liberties of the country, and I have been encouraged the "more to do so by the Resolution which "stands recorded in the Journals, which "has been this day read at your table, "and also by the language contained in "the first paragraph of the Resolution "which was recorded on your Journals "but sixteen days ago."

Here the hon. gent. sat down, and immediately the Chancellor of the Exchequer rose, when lord Folkestone called the right hon. gent. to order, and contended that he need not withdraw, and ought not to be heard, according to the precedent of Shepherd, until the motion of his hon. friend was before the House. Here a short discussion, as to the point of order, arose between lord Folkestone, sir John Anstruther, and Mr. Horner, when, upon the Speaker's interposition, it was agreed that Mr. Perceval and lord Castle-reagh should be severally heard in their defence, and be permitted to withdraw before the Motion was put from the Chair.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. PERCEVAL) then rose, and said that he had waited for the decision of gentlemen upon the point of order, as he felt himself naturally anxious to conform to whatever was the wish of the House, as to the form of their proceedings upon the present occasion. He however acknowledged that he was prepared to expect the decision that had been made by the Chair, as to the propriety of his then speaking, and afterwards immediately retiring. He did not wish to quarrel with or canvas whatever might have been the wish of the House, as to the manner in which he was to act in the present instance, but he thought that the usage of the House on such occasions was founded in wisdom, as the presence of the individual accused during the agitation of the charges against him might be fairly suspected to operate in a way that would fetter and restrain the freedom of the discussion itself. At the same time he felt that that Order of the House was not without its inconveniences as well as its advantages. It might be as much, if not more necessary to the just vindication of a man's innocence, to hear the close of a discussion of that sort as well as the commencement, and perhaps the progress of it as much as either; but that as it might, the course being otherwise, it was for him now only to abide by it. And here he was free to confess, that he felt exceeding great doubt as to the line of address which it best became him in that situation to pursue. If he thought it a mere criminatory proceeding against an individual of that House, for alledged mal-practices, there he could have no doubt that the House would willingly entertain the Charge, and of course the individual would proceed at once upon his defence, meeting the charges either with direct denial, explanation of the fact, or examination into the law arising out of the fact. But with respect to the present charge, he confessed that he could not look upon it in that simple light. As well as he understood the hon. gent. he intimated in the opening of his charges, that there was still behind them a mass of other matter; and, indeed, that intimation had been sufficiently illustrated in the detailed statements entered into by the hon. gent. respecting the boroughs of Hastings, Rye, Cambridge, and Queenborough. By stating these circumstances it did appear that it was not so much the vindication of the injured honour of that House which

was the object, as that more general one of following up the pursuit of what was denominated ‘a certain System.’ This, it seemed, was to be a first step to general Reform. The notice with respect to the great measure itself appeared to have been withdrawn, and this proceeding to be substituted in its place. If this was so, perhaps the House would think it right to pause, before they lent their sanction to such a mode of introducing the discussion of any great public question; (*hear, hear!*) Perhaps they would feel it to be their indispensable duty not to establish a precedent that would introduce a system of inquisitorial proceedings, fraught with the most violent inroads upon all species of private and social confidence. (*Hear, hear!*) No matter through what means the charge had been elicited—no matter how sacred the confidence the discovery had violated, or how solemn the engagements it had broken through, (*hear, hear!*) at any period it would be ill advised to establish such a precedent, but particularly so at the present day. They lived in a time in which the popular appetite fed upon attacks on public men. The favourite doctrine was, that public men must be necessarily corrupt; and they were the purest patriots who prosecuted most charges against them—they lived in a time when they saw individuals raised to the highest state of popularity, and honoured with crowded tributes of the nation’s gratitude and applause for prosecuting such charges. Those who were ambitious of the same flattering distinctions might think it wise to pursue the same course—no matter whatever the means, if the end could be attained. They had seen private confidence abused—they had heard of letters being seized in the unsuspecting moments of social intercourse, and had known serious Charges to be grounded upon the public disclosure of those very letters (*hear, hear!*) and they had seen those who thought it necessary to resort to such means, not to confirm, but to institute a Charge which ranks high in the esteem and veneration of the people of this country; whether AT SUCH A TIME it would be wise to warrant such species of Charges as merely introductory to the agitation of the great question of Reform, he left it to the House to determine; but as far as he might be allowed to judge, he rather thought that it would be more consistent with what was due from him to the House and to the Public, if he, FOR THE PRESENT, declined putting in the plea (he could so con-

scientiously put in), until the House had come to a determination on the propriety of entertaining that Charge or not (*hear, hear!*) protesting at the same time against any, the slightest inference of his guilt from his deferring such a plea till after that decision—THEN would he come before them prepared, and indeed, (what he was not yet) in a manner authorised to meet that Charge, and explain, as he trusted he could do, every particular relating to the transaction upon which the charge had been grounded; and he did not despair of that explanation proving satisfactory to the House, and vindictory of his own honour. Before the House had come to such a decision, he should not hold it wise in any public man to enter into an explanation of the circumstances upon the one side or the other. He should say no more, but make his bow to the Chair, as was usual in such cases, and leave it with the House to determine as they in their judgment might think proper.—The right hon. gentleman then made his obeisance to the Speaker, and retired AMIDST THE GENERAL CHEERS OF THE HOUSE.

LORD CASTLEREAGH stated his perfect coincidence in the line of proceeding determined upon by his right hon. friend (Mr. Perceval), and expressed his intention of delaying his observations in defence until the proper period arrived, if it should be the pleasure of the House to proceed in the investigation.

MR. MADOCKS then explicitly moved, that the said Charge against the right hon. Spencer Perceval and lord visc. Castlereagh should be heard at the Bar on Monday next.

MR. TIERNEY considered it due to the House, that the hon. mover should furnish it with a clear and concise statement of that which constituted the basis of the charge. It was, in his opinion, necessary that it should be in possession of that which the motion conveyed, namely, that the House had been informed of the particulars of the accusation. Certainly the hon. mover had read a long statement, which, perhaps, was conceived by him as imparting the fullest information; but for himself he would say, that he wished for something more certain and concise than his recollection of that statement, and it was also to be considered, that since the hon. mover had read it many Members had entered the House.

THE SPEAKER stated that it would be convenient for the House to know, whether it was the intention of the hon. mover to regulate his future proceedings by the precedent in the case of Mr. Samuel Shepherd. He wished that the two Resolutions subsequent to the information being given by a member in his place, should be read.—The two Resolutions were accordingly read:—the first, where a reference was made to the protest of Mr. Shepherd, as to his innocence, and the next as to the particular boroughs, viz. Newport and Worthton Bassett, where he had been guilty of the corrupt practices, and the course pursued by the House in consequence.—From this precedent it did appear, resumed the Speaker, that after the Member made the information to the House, a motion was made to hear the accused at the bar, previous to which hearing the particulars of the charge were ordered to be given to them in writing; and, lastly, that a particular day should be fixed.

MR. WHITBREAD apprehended that, consistent with any precedent on their Journals, even with the precedent alluded to, the hon. mover was not bound to give any specific written statement of his charge against the persons affected by it. It had long been the practice to proceed to investigations of a similar nature upon oral statements, and if the hon. mover would omit the insertion of a particular day, he could not see the grounds for any valid objection to the present motion. The House had before it a recent and very remote precedent in the case of the Duke of York, and therefore he could not divine the reasons for a deviation upon that occasion. With respect to the observations of his right hon. friend (Mr. Tierney) that since the Charge was read many Members had entered the House, such an objection stood upon no Parliamentary grounds, inasmuch as when the House was met all Members were presumed to be present, and no allowance for absence upon such occasions were made, save and except that no such charges could be preferred in the absence of the persons whom they went to accuse.

MR. SECRETARY CANNING considered the recent instance in the case of the Duke of York, upon all prudential and discretionary reasons, the fittest line to be followed on this occasion. He also thought the motion so worded, as in its acquiescence neither to be unjust to the accused,

or inconvenient to those bound to investigate.

LORD FOLKESTONE, as a question of order, expressed his anxiety that the precedent in the case of Mr. Shepherd should be acted up to literally and totally, and his reason for the observation arose from seeing on the Votes of the House, in recording the notice of the present motion by his honourable friend, that the terms used were not Information but Charge. The noble lord also stated, that the desire of the right hon. gent. (Mr. Tierney) for a precise statement, might be a very convenient one for the accused, still if keeping to the precedent the House would see that neither the nature of the practices, the practices themselves, or the names of the persons upon whom the influence was exerted, were detailed. Indeed, nothing more was given than a dry statement of the boroughs where the corruption was exercised.

The motion of Mr. Madocks was then read from the Chair, when Mr. Whitbread and sir Francis Burdett rose at the same moment to second it.

MR. CARTWRIGHT attributed the present motion to the same influence which had operated with the honourable member, to second certain Resolutions at a late public meeting. Against the principles attempted to be upheld that day, and as the friend to the Constitution as it then existed, he pledged himself the opponent to what was clamorously termed Parliamentary Reformation. Whilst he gave that decided opinion, he would be on all occasions the sincere supporter of all proper and efficacious correction of abuses when proved to exist.—It was the observation of a great man, “that reformation bringeth the desire of change, but that the desire of change bringeth forward reformation.” The French Revolution had too lamentably illustrated that position in modern times. After the calamitous effects of that event, even if he had been friendly to Parliamentary Reform heretofore, the present awful moment he still felt convinced was the most ill-timed for entertaining the subject. That in estimating the present public opinion upon late occurrences, there existed much delusion, he would contend, and indeed he had a forcible illustration in the county town (Northampton) of the county which he had the honour to represent. In that town a requisition had been signed by seventeen

persons, to convene a meeting for thanking the hon. member (Mr. Wardle) opposite, for his exertions on a late investigation—against that a counter-requisition was signed by seventy-two inhabitants, with whose request the Chief Magistrate complied. The original requisitionists, however, had a meeting at a tavern, and there carried their vote of thanks, which they will pretend to pass as the unanimous opinion of the town.

LORD MILTON observed, that if the last speaker was even correct in the motives he attributed to the hon. gent. who brought forward the present motion, he must assure him that if such motives were justified, those who supported the motion were actuated by inducements wholly different. For instance, if he thought that the present motion tended to the success of the question of Parliamentary Reform, he would have been the first to oppose it, because he was free to say that from its adoption *he could not foresee any practical benefit*. He still was impressed with the necessity of correcting public abuses, and none more imperatively called for correction, as none were more dangerous, than *palpable and evident interference of the King's Ministers in obtaining the return of Members to that House*. In giving such an opinion, and whilst he voted for the motion in part, he still, in whatever way it was decided, *would not think one jot the worse of either of the rt. hon. gentlemen accused, or that they were in any degree more criminal than all former governments*. The evil ought, however, to cease, and any prospective remedy would have his support. As leading to that object he was anxious to refer the consideration of this charge either to a Parliamentary Commission or to a Select Committee, convinced that the greatest injury had evinced itself by giving a Parliamentary strength to a government which did not possess the confidence of the People. The noble lord concluded by moving as an Amendment, That in place of the words “at the bar,” the said Charge be referred to a Select Committee.

SIR CHARLES MORGAN declared his decided opposition to the motion. He considered that the moment for the House, if it consulted its own dignity, and the permanent interests of the country, to make a stand against all the efforts of popular clamour. He guarded the House against all acceding to a system, which had for its object to degrade and to vilify all pub-

lic men, to make every person of that description its victim, and to consider no other man pure who had not been filtered through the purifying vessel of modern patriotism.—The honourable member's voice fell so considerably, that it was impossible to hear the remainder of his observations.

SIR J. ANSTRUTHER stated that the present motion was an attack equally against all executive Governments, both past and to come. There was a great attack now-a days against the influence and attachments of party; but still he strongly suspected that there was in contemplation another party to which the hon. mover may belong, but of which he was not solicitous to be fully informed, whose object was to level down all public men to their own very humble state. If there was, as he strongly suspected, a party having such views, sure he was that the present motion was well calculated to promote their object. The ball was to be opened with the borough of Cashel, but the hon. mover explicitly told us that it was but a part of his intended investigation, and, of course, the House had no means of ascertaining where he intended to stop. Why was it not informed of all that was meant to be done with that Committee? Did the hon. mover propose the present motion as a new gratification of the public appetite for scandal, and thus obtain a greater number of converts to his scheme of Parliamentary Reform? To excite that disgust and disregard, dissension, and perhaps the detestation of that House, which would ultimately go rather to destroy, than to reform Parliament. If abuses exist, let the correction be prospective, but let it not be introduced upon a retrospective process, with a view of making that criminal which was not probably criminal before; and upon what inducement? The presumed information of a member in his place. To inform, in his apprehension, meant to convey information, and he would ask, was there in the statement of the hon. mover any ground upon which the most subordinate magistrates would proceed. If such undefined accusations were sanctioned in that House, then with equal propriety must it prepare itself to hear repeated the idle conversations of every club-room (*Hear! hear! from the Ministerial benches*); and for what he knew, the very information upon which the House was now called to proceed might have originated from such a source. If such was the fact, he would say, that a

the man who uttered such a statement did by such conduct violate every principle of honour and of confidence, he would not give to such a man credit at the bar! Good God! were all the ties of private confidence and private virtue to be cleft in pieces by the rascality of a few individuals, exerting every effort to gratify that public scandal which was by themselves excited. To the legitimate and serious opinion of the public he trusted that House would ever lend a deep and prompt attention; but he admonished it how it yielded even for a moment to that appeal, which was nothing more than public clamour. The House should keep its even and steady course, unbiased either by the influence of the Court or the turbulence of the People; and by such conduct, if it failed to obtain, it still would have the consciousness of deserving the approbation of a grateful and high-minded people.

MR. CURWEN could not suppose that, after the 25 last years of *uncomplained of sacrifice*, any part of the people of this kingdom looked to *any change other than a reform of abuses*. With respect to the question of Parliamentary Reform, he had been formerly friendly to it; but he was willing to admit his opinion that the present was not the most favourable season for bringing it into discussion. He was as great an advocate as any man in that House for the Constitution, but he was also anxious to get rid of its abuses. The laws of the land and the statutes of the legislature held no dubious language upon that head, but all directed their provisions to weed out or to prevent public corruptions. Whatever might be his preference to a Parliamentary Commission, he considered that, after the hard measure of justice which, in the same stage of the proceeding, had been dealt out to the Duke of York, the House was bound to follow the same course on the present occasion. He wished that the hon. mover had deferred the motion until he had seen how a certain measure, tending to prevent such practices, had been received by the House. As he had not done so, in consistence with the vote which, on a late occasion he had given, he would also support the proposition of the hon. mover; although he thought it the true system now to throw a veil over what was past, and sincerely guard against the recurrence.

MR. BIDDULPH briefly supported the motion.

SIR FRANCIS BURDETT observed that the character of the House was most materially concerned in the question now brought before it, and that a more important subject could not engage its attention. The objections to the motion, he contended, were not founded either in principle or precedent. Supposing the point of principle, however, out of the question, he affirmed that the motion of his hon. friend was perfectly consistent with the most sound and approved parliamentary precedents. He had written down a great variety of precedents, in order to prove the accuracy of this assertion, which, however, from the turn which the debate had taken, he did not think it necessary to state. The hon. baronet contended that they used a most unwarrantable liberty with the inquisitorial powers of that House who could ascribe any motives to his honourable friend except a conscientious and manful discharge of his duty. It had been decided in the House of Commons, that that House was bound to receive information upon a subject of this nature, and to act upon that information, even upon common report. How much more was the House bound to act upon that which was known by most and believed by all? (*Hear, Hear!*) He would be glad to hear any gentleman on the other side get up, and lay his hand upon his heart, and say that he did not believe the existence of such practices as those which were now charged—practices which tended to give the most mortal stab to the character of that House. If it was possible for any gentleman there to defend such things, as to contend that these practices, which were pregnant with destruction to the Constitution, formed part of the Constitution itself, then he must say that Bonaparte had a better ally within these walls than he had any where else, (*Loud cries of hear, hear! from the ministerial side of the House.*) He was not surprised to be met with a “hear, hear!” from men professing the same principles which had brought other nations to destruction—other nations, the principal object of whose governments had been to subdue their own subjects instead of their foreign enemies. He desired the gentlemen who were so ready to call out “hear, hear,” to shew him any Government which had of late been subverted by its own subjects, except through that apathy which the errors of such Governments had created as to the career of a foreign enemy.—The honourable baronet further observed, that what he and

those who were actuated by the same principles demanded, was nothing more than the Constitution—and they desired reform not for the subversion but for the establishment of the Constitution. The noble lord (Milton) seemed to think that as this was an established practice—a sort of trade which had been regularly carried on by every Government for a long period, he should not think the less of the Ministers now accused, even though the charge should be proved. He perhaps agreed with the noble lord in that sentiment. But at the same time what inference the country would draw from such an opinion, the friends of corruption ought well to consider. They ought to beware of having a rooted conviction established in the country, that corruption was become so common with respect to Seats in that House, that it had ceased to be there regarded as an offence; or would they with sound of trumpet through the land proclaim, that not to be corrupt is the shame! But, if they meant to deny the existence of such corruption, let them come to the proof.—It was impossible, surely, consistently to maintain that corruption was not mischievous, for the Committees appointed by the House itself, had constantly been exposing and reprobating such abuses.—The principles which he had always possessed, did not rest merely on any theoretical conclusions of his own, but were to be found in the Statute Books. His object was to restore the Constitution to that purity which it ought to have, and which it was understood to possess in theory. All he now said was that if one of the organs by which the Constitution was administered was corrupt, it was impossible that the Constitution could be sound in practice, whatever it might be in theory. A charge of Corruption in procuring returns to that House had been brought against two of its Members. If the House refused to proceed to inquire into the truth of the allegations, the manifest conclusion would be, what had been already hinted at, that the offence was too common to be considered as a ground of punishment. One gentleman had said that exclusive demerit rested not with the accused, and they therefore ought not to be exposed. That, however, was not a sort of defence that ought to be satisfactory, or that would be satisfactory to the country. With regard to the bill to prevent the Sale of Seats in that House, proposed to be introduced by the hon. gent. near him (Mr. Curwen) he doubted whether its effect would not be to prevent the

carrying on of the trade by individuals, and to throw it entirely into the hands of the Treasury. But the state of the question was this—either we had a Representation, or we had not. If we had not a real Representation of the people, we ought to procure it as soon as possible, for no succedaneum could answer the purpose, whatever means might be devised for propping a corrupt and rotten system. The honourable baronet on the floor (Sir J. Anstruther) had, in attempting to give a definition of the word “information,” expressed a doubt whether he understood the English language. But whether he understood the English language or not, the hon. baronet seemed to have been very well acquainted with the feelings of the House. He appeared to have had a notion that the feeling of the House was against inquiry; and the cheers with which his speech had been received was a strong proof of the accuracy of his opinion on that point. Much had been said with a view to shew that the charge was not properly preferred. He, however (Sir F. B.) thought there could be no doubt that the charge was in itself founded upon the most constitutional principles, and brought forward in a way that was warranted by many parliamentary precedents.

MR. D. GIDDY thought that those who were so loud in the condemnation of corruption did not sufficiently distinguish between corruption, properly so called, and the influence which property would always have in every well regulated society. The influence of property was one which ought to prevail as well as that of ability. He would always be glad to have some eminent lawyers in the House—to see gentlemen of the Army and Navy there. The Landed Interest ought unquestionably to have its full weight, but he saw no reason why those who had their fortunes in chattels or money should be excluded. He saw no reason why some of the Directors of the East India Company should not possess seats in that House, since they had important interests to defend. (*Hear, hear!* in one quarter, and a *laugh* in another). There never was a question of importance discussed in that House, without a proof that the interests affected by it had some persons to represent them. Mr. D. G. also remarked, that under this system the country, in spite of all the wars in which it had been engaged, had flourished. Every town had been improved; new harbours had been con-

structed ; and manufactures and trade increased together. These were blessings not to be rashly risked for any fanciful schemes of reform (*Hear, hear, from Mr. Windham*). At the same time, where corruption was proved to exist, he would concur in adopting the proper means to check it, always, however, distinguishing between corruption, and that just and proper influence which ought to be inseparable from property.

MR. TIERNEY expressed his wish that the charge against Mr. Perceval should be separated from that preferred against Lord Castlereagh ; and observed, that in the case of Shepherd, the charge had been given in writing, and he hoped the hon. gent. would give in his charge in this way, that gentlemen might clearly understand upon what they were to vote. He thought this question had, strictly speaking, nothing to do with Parliamentary Reform, for the offence was one which might be committed under any circumstances. The charge against Mr. Perceval and Mr. Wellesley was so vague, that he would be ashamed to receive it in its present shape. But as to the charge against Lord Castlereagh, that certainly deserved attention, both from its being more distinctly laid, and from the circumstance that 167 members of that House had already pronounced that noble lord to have been guilty of a breach of its privileges.—With regard to Parliamentary Reform, Mr. T. said, that he was as warmly attached to that as he had ever been. It was one of the greatest advantages of the Constitution, that when things went wrong the House had the power of making them better. He, however, was perfectly aware of the inconvenience of the time which had been chosen to bring forward the question—chiefly because it did not appear to him that either the sense of the Country or of Parliament was decidedly in its favour. The question had been raised merely by the business of the Duke of York ; and he believed that there were many who supported the cry for Parliamentary Reform who had no specific view of the subject which they themselves desired to attain—(*Hear, hear!*) What many, he believed, understood by Parliamentary Reform was a relief from the weight of the taxes. He must have little associated with the various classes of society in this country, who was not convinced of the deep-rooted complaints which were called forth by the burthens of the taxes, and the manner in

which they were collected. If any one would for a moment consider the weight of all the other taxes, added to that of the Income Tax, he would not be surprised that numbers were disposed to listen to any proposal which promised an alleviation of that burthen. There was no disposition any where for overturning the establishments of the constitution ; but the people readily listened to those who from good or bad motives proposed Reform, because the idea was to encourage the hope that by this Reform they would be in some measure at least relieved from the pressure of taxation. But that was a sense in which he did not wish Reform to be understood. Nor would he be in the least accessory to the propagation of such a delusion. The discussion of the subject of Reform, however, did not at all call for a question like that now before the House. If they intended to bring the subject of Reform before the House, why did they not do it directly ? Why should they think it necessary to begin by attempting to degrade all public men and every government ?—The late Mr. Pitt, Mr. T. observed, had gone farther in his project than the mere prevention of the sale and purchase of seats, for he proposed that the burgage tenures should be bought up, as they had subsequently been in Ireland. But among all the schemes of Parliamentary Reform of which he had heard, he had never known of a commencement like that which the House was now called upon to adopt. He knew that a wonderful degree of popularity might at present be acquired, by saying that one belonged to no party. But of this kind of popularity he was far from being ambitious, because without being a party man it would be impossible to accomplish any great object, and because he was persuaded that the country had derived more advantages from party warfare in that House, than from any other circumstance whatever. He therefore wished for none of the popularity that must result from his being no party man. He was a zealous party man, and only wished he were a better. But the gentlemen themselves who had set up this cry of “no party,” after all constituted a party. They attended and voted together on questions which some considered as of minor importance, but as to those which were generally considered as of the greatest consequence, such as the fate of armies, they did not think it necessary to give any vote, and all stayed away. They proceeded in all this as if

they were acting under a leader—and a leader, be he who he may, they either had or must soon be compelled to appoint.—One of the most remarkable characteristics of this party was the attention which it paid to stage effect, (*Hear! hear!*) in carefully concealing the ultimate object at which it aimed. (*Hear! hear!*) Of the two other parties, they gave the preference to the gentlemen on the other side; but yet the only result of that preference was a charge against two of them by which they were compelled to leave the House. (*Hear! hear!*) But why did they think Ministers better than those who sat near him? The reason very probably was, that a weak Administration might be more valuable to those who had such views. For all this he might expect to be subject to reproaches. The usual cry would be renewed, “ When any motion is made against ‘ corruption, the parties immediately understand each other, and join against it.’ ” There was, indeed, one charge against him, a very heavy one in their opinion, which he could not deny. He had certainly been in office—but these gentlemen referred the House to the Reports of their Committees in support of their assertions, that corruption prevailed in every department of the state. Did they really believe it possible, that, in the management of so many complicated concerns, and of so large an expenditure, no mal-practices should at any time occur? It could not be done; and hence the advantage of appointing Committees from time to time. The abuses were not, however, greater perhaps, than might have been expected; and these being pointed out in the Reports, the House had an opportunity of applying the remedies. Many improvements in the conduct of various departments had been the consequence of this mode of proceeding. Mr. T. then observed that he differed widely from the hon. bart. with regard to the bill of his hon. friend (Mr. Curwen) behind him. He thought the bill would do a great deal of good; but if the hon. bart. (Burdett) was of opinion, that the security which it proposed against the sale of seats was not sufficient, he himself ought to attend and propose a better. It was sufficient for him, however, that Parliament had agreed to the principle, that such trafficking in seats ought to be abolished. He saw no reason for going into the past; and he asked, whether any thing could be more unjust than to turn round upon two gentlemen, whose conduct had not been attended with any peculiar aggravation. Mr.

T. however, acknowledged that some reform there must be, and the more gradual he would be the better pleased. *Something however, must be done to remove any injurious impressions which the people had of that House.* The landed interest ought for obvious reasons, to have the greatest weight in the House, though it ought not to be all in all. The monied interest ought to have considerable influence. But at the same time it was proper that mere money should not procure a seat in that House, and give rise to speculations which no one could see without pain. But it would be great injustice to render a few individuals the victims of a system which did not commence with them. He concluded by saying, that he would move an Amendment to the Motion, with a view to exclude that part of the charge relating to Mr. Perceval and Mr. Wellesley, and to retain only that which related to lord Castlereagh.

A short conversation then took place between Mr. Tierney and the Speaker, respecting the proper mode in point of form of introducing this Amendment.

MR. WHITBREAD expressed his astonishment to hear the measure of Parliamentary Reform objected to by his right hon. friend in point of time, the more so as that objection was grounded upon the same arguments which his rt. hon. friend, he, and others, had on former occasions to encounter from the other side of the House. With regard to the public meetings, from which declarations of opinion had been published upon the subject of the decision of the House relative to the Conduct of the Duke of York, *he maintained the right of the people to express their opinion upon any public question*, asserting that there were numbers among the public who were as competent to form a correct opinion upon that or any other question, as the Members of that House. To think otherwise on the part of the House, he would consider as an indication of arrogance and folly. The people had the whole of the evidence before them with respect to the transaction alluded to, and upon that evidence they thought proper to come to a conclusion directly contrary to that of the House. Was it to be wondered at then, that such a conclusion, and the considerations connected with it, should have induced the mind of the country to conceive that all was not right in that House, and that some reform in the representation was necessary. As to the attack

which it was alledged was systematically made upon public men, he wished to know whether serious disposition to very gross attack did not prevail against those who were anxious to expose and punish abuses, even more than against those who were supposed to profit by the existence of such abuses. He remembered, not many nights ago, to have heard it stated in that House by an hon. gent. that he would rather be Mrs. Clarke with all her vices, than pursue the conduct of the hon. gent. who brought her forward. This he offered as a specimen of what those were liable to who struggled upon the side of the people, and as some counterpoise to the murmuring of those gentlemen who felt so very indignant at accusations, accompanied by an offer of proof, which still they would not suffer the House to receive. So that although their pride was hurt, and their character impeached, they would not allow their principles to be vindicated. Although he supported the motion, as he would any measure connected with Reform, or the correction of abuses, there were two points in which he differed from those so pointedly alluded to by his right hon. friend: for he neither disclaimed party, nor did he profess that extraordinary purity, which was described as a cloak for mischievous designs. Giving every man credit for all the integrity that he could consistently claim, he believed there was no public man whatever whose motives were not of a mixed nature. His own motives he confessed to be of that character, and still he believed himself as well disposed to do good as any other man—and in the prosecution of that good he would not suffer his mind to be warped by popularity either within or without doors. Parliamentary Reform he conceived to be the greatest good the country could experience, and therefore he sought for it. He thought it necessary in order to prevent convulsion; but he never did think, nor did he ever say, that it would operate like enchantment, as a panacea for all evils. He never was deluded by theories, but looked for that Reform only which was sought for by so many great men, by Mr. Blackstone, by Dr. Paley, by Mr. Fox, by Mr. Pitt, and many others. If these great men could now be communicated with, if one of them at least were enabled to offer his advice, sure he was that that wise man, whose principles he contracted at his outset in political life, would strongly recommend the conduct he was now pursuing.—Several gentlemen, particularly about the Mi-

nisterial Bench, had, he recollects, professed their resolution to wage war with corruption; but if such a case as that then before the House did not rouse them to act, he could not conceive when they would give battle. Here were two Ministers of State accused of receiving money for a Seat in that House, calling upon the person purchasing such seat to vacate, because he would not vote against his conscience. *How the money arising out of the purchase had been disposed of the House was yet to learn.* The Chancellor of the Exchequer had talked of the violations of social confidence in the disclosure of this transaction. But in fact there was no social confidence in the case on the part of his honourable friend. The information he received he laid, as was his duty, before the House, and it was for the House to decide how it would act for the preservation of its own honour and character. But it was pretended, that as there was such a disposition to abuse public men, it was here proper to make a stand against inquiry.—What, in such a flagrant case? The present ministers would not determine upon such a stand in the instance of the Hampshire Election. They would then prosecute Mr. Freemantle with the utmost rigour for writing a letter to a single voter: and yet now they would claim complete impunity for the Chancellor of the Exchequer and lord Castlereagh, who had sold a seat to a Member upon certain terms to obtain his vote, and afterwards turned him out of his seat because he would not vote against his judgment. *If such a case as this were overlooked, the House might as well, in his opinion, expunge its Journals, burn its Statutes, and blot out the Constitution.* But, gentlemen asserted that there was no precedent for these retrospective inquiries—Did they forget that, in one of the most corrupt periods of our history, at the close of sir Robert Walpole's Administration, a Committee was appointed to inquire into the abuses of that Administration for no less than ten years back? In these gentlemen, who voted against lord Castlereagh upon a former night for an act of corruption, which was only nicheate, he thought it would be exceedingly inconsistent to vote against this motion, where the act was alledged to be complete.—The opinion in favour of Reform he believed to be much more general than it had been at any former period, and it was very easily to be accounted for. *The result of the Investigation respecting the Duke of York, the rejection of the Reversion Bill, and the vote in favour of lord*

*Castlereagh, formed strong additional reasons for discrediting the composition of that House, and naturally multiplied the advocates for Reform.* Still he thought the sentiment in support of Reform, when it was last discussed, would have been much louder, more universal and effective, if it had not been for the extraordinary exercise of the influence of the Crown. This exercise was most strongly exemplified in the case of the celebrated Robert Burns, the poet, as appeared from a letter of his published since his death. Burns was an exciseman, and having, by the liberality of his sentiments, incurred the imputation, the surveyor called upon him by order of the Commissioners. Burns disclaimed the charge; but although under the apprehension of being sent with his family to seek for bread, for the produce of his works was insufficient to support a sick brother, he ventured to say that the corruption of the Legislature, and the extending influence of the Executive, boded no good to the country. Upon which the Surveyor observed authoritatively—"It is your business Sir, to act, and not to think—be silent and obedient." (*A laugh at the back of the Ministerial benches.*) Mr. Whitbread reprobed such levity. Sure he was that those who could laugh at such an insolent observation must be very much inferior indeed, in genius and worth, to the man to whom it was addressed.—It had become a fashion, he perceived of late, to call upon gentlemen, rather improperly as he thought, for a profession of faith upon certain political tenets.—For himself, however, he had no objection to make the profession required. He certainly was not an advocate for the exclusion of all placemen from seats in that House. Although he knew there were many who had no right to be there, he would rather prefer the presence of Ministers, in order that they might be confronted with their accusers, that they might account for their conduct, and display their views to the House. He was also adverse to the idea, that it was of no consequence by whom the affairs of the Government were administered. It appeared to him quite preposterous, even if corruption were not removed or diminished, that it would not be material to consider by whom the power of the country should be directed. What, that if the vessel were in a crazy state, and its sails rent, it mattered not what pilot was at the helm!—There was not perhaps a man in society who felt more horror at the idea

of revolution than he did. His all was at stake. He enjoyed many comforts, and valuing the British Constitution, he would not risk its loss for any untried system—still less for a Republic. He was no admirer of Republican Governments. They had both in ancient and modern times been corrupt and arbitrary. Even in Athens, supposed the purest Republic, corruption pervaded the whole community, the people being bribed by the orators, and the orators bribed by foreign states, Demosthenes himself not being free from the imputation; but aversion to the idea of revolution must utterly blindfold the judgment of any man, who could suppose that such an evil was likely to arise, if lord Castlereagh were not granted impunity for a two-fold abuse of patronage, and if such a case as that before the House were not overlooked: the notion was perfectly ridiculous.—The hon. gent. concluded with exhorting the House to guard the country against the fate which all the corrupt Governments of Europe had experienced—to conciliate the people to their Government, and not to reduce England to the state in which Sicily now was, where the conduct of its Government had rendered the people indifferent to the fate which seemed to menace them.

MR. B. BATHURST saw no reason why it should be assumed that he, and the gentlemen who voted with him in the majority upon the Duke of York's case, had not come to a correct and conscientious conclusion. That they did so he had no doubt would be the prevalent opinion of the country, when the present ferment subsided, and gentlemen had an opportunity of explaining the grounds of their conduct to their constituents. As to the question of Reform, and the extraordinary professions of purity by which it was recommended from certain quarters, he begged the House to examine those professions. It would be recollect, that of all the corruptions which had occurred, or were ever reported to have occurred, at popular elections—even the story of Punch at Shaftesbury sunk into insignificance, when compared to the creation of the hundreds of voters for the Isleworth Mill (*Hear! hear! from the Ministerial benches.*). The right hon. gent. expressed his resolution to oppose this motion, or any other of a similar nature, which promised to give food and fuel to that popular ferment which it should be the object of the House to allay.

LORD COCHRANE said, his principal reason for supporting Parliamentary Reform upon old constitutional principles was, as he had stated at a late popular meeting, in order to set ministers free from those discussions, which occupied too much of their time, and rendered them unable to attend to the important business of their several departments, the neglect of which he had too often witnessed on foreign stations. If the people were fairly represented in that House, his opinion was, that there would be less of captious opposition or tedious controversy; corruption would be set aside; opposition would have no abuses to point out; and ministers, being disengaged from the task of defending such things, would be able to devote their minds more profitably for the state, to the objects he had before alluded to.

MR. PONSONBY said that the allusions to Popular Meetings, and to Parliamentary Reform were quite irrelevant to the question before the House. As to Reform, he would not, as he had before said, deliver any opinion on that subject incidently, nor until it was brought before the House for discussion. The question before the House involved a charge against two of the Ministers relative to the Sale of a Seat in that House.—But he would appeal to all who heard him, whether many Seats were not sold, and that being notorious, he never could persuade himself to take advantage of such a circumstance in a political adversary for the purpose of running him down. There was, perhaps, no public man in the world, with regard to whom he felt such deep resentment as against one of the persons implicated by this accusation (Castlereagh). He disliked him for his conduct in Ireland, in that country whose prosperity he had marred—whose population he had persecuted—whose consequence he had degraded—whose independence he had extinguished by practices, into the detail of which he would not then enter. But the more he felt those sentiments with respect to that noble lord, the more he strove to controul his feelings in order to correct his judgment. He had voted against the noble lord (Castlereagh) the other night, because the noble lord himself confessed his guilt. But in that case he could not consider the application to him by Mr. Dick to be any thing more than the application of one friend to another to facilitate his attainment of a seat in Parliament. Such things were known to be done by hundreds, and why, therefore, inquire into this trans-

action. The practice of trafficking in Seats had, he admitted, BECAME AS GLARING AS THE NOON-DAY SUN, and the excess had so much scandalized the country, that it became necessary to interfere. That interference had taken place in the Bill to be brought in by his hon. friend (Mr. Curwen), and this measure would, he trusted, be rendered by the wisdom of the House a complete remedy for the evil complained of. It might be said, that he was delicate upon this subject, lest some of his own friends might be detected in such proceedings. Perhaps some of his friends were so guilty, he could not say, but for himself he could declare, that he had never paid a shilling to any man for his vote. But the practice complained of was so long, and so universally known to have prevailed, that he could not reconcile it to his notions of liberality and justice to select these two individuals as the victims.

LORD FOLKESTONE thought it must appear rather inconsistent that gentlemen should support the Bill of the hon. gent. (Mr. Curwen), if the practice it proposed to correct were not deemed blameable, and if that practice were so *blameable*, how could the acquittal of the two ministers referred to in the motion be justified. But the approbation of both parties in the House, with regard to the bill alluded to, was somewhat new and surprising. He never heard of that approbation until this night, and he hoped it was not effected to answer that occasion, to create a diversion in favour of the accused. But supposing this bill passed that House, it might be thrown out in the lords, and then what a dilemma would the House be placed in, if it overlooked the subject of the accusation. When he first mentioned such shameful practices as this charge referred to, he remembered that he was met by a cheer of disapprobation from the other side, and was challenged to proof. Yet now gentlemen were not ashamed to avow that these disgraceful transactions were as notorious as the noon-day sun, and that was admitted without proof. When he brought forward his motion for inquiry, it was objected to upon the ground that his charges were *too general*. And now this motion was resisted because it was *too specific*. So that no form of proceeding could suit those gentlemen, because, in plain English, it was not their interest to investigate any charge.—If not, he would be glad to know who were the greater enemies to public character—they who would mark out and exclude improper

persons from public station, or they who would unblushingly resist all inquiry, upon the avowed ground that corruption was so extensive, that no individual charge could be admitted? Could gentlemen be surprised if, after such an avowal from both sides, the public should be distrustful of the honour and character of that House? Such distrust did exist, and it was notorious. He deprecated the idea of supposing that it was to be removed by any other means than by inquiry, and proving it to be unfounded. *Resisting inquiry only served to strengthen the influence and to extend the limits of suspicion, by comprehending all those who connected themselves with such resistance.* The noble lord concluded with declaring his resolution to oppose the Amendment, and to vote for the original motion.

MR. WINDHAM entered into a variety of ingenious arguments in support of his opinion upon the subject of Reform. There were many things of the nature referred to in this motion, which were, in fact, coeval and coexistent with the constitution itself, and they had "grown with its growth and strengthened with its strength." These things were, in fact, so interwoven with the constitution, and that constitution itself was such a complicated system, that no wise statesman would venture to tear them out, *lest he should take out something very valuable along with them.* *The constitution was like the elements of the air we breathe, some of which were poisonous, and yet if those elements were extricated the earth would not be habitable.* When gentlemen talked of the theory of the Constitution, they seemed to forget that those corruptions, as they were called, formed part of that theory, for they were to be found coexisting with the Constitution in all times, even in the best of times—even in the days of the Great Chatham, as he was termed. That noble lord, no doubt, made use of this species of traffic, and upon the principles stated, namely, as a part of the defence of government. He must have made use of corruption. For, in fact, there was corruption in the country from top to bottom, and from bottom to top, differing only in this respect, that it was more dense at bottom, and became purer as you advanced to the top. That when you came to the top you found no corruption, it would be preposterous to assert. Men were, as his hon. friend observed, influenced by mixed motives, and he did not know himself a human creature who denied it. Ambition had his full

operation on public men, and a sort of corruption was sometimes necessary to gratify it. But he could never believe that any thing low, such as the embezzlement of money, was among the higher order of public men. Indeed the commotion created by any such charge, was, in itself, proof that the thing was unlikely. To guard against embezzlement on the part of agents, was impossible in the extensive expenditure of our revenues, and therefore any charge against any minister upon that ground would be totally unjust. If a man, in his own private family, could not guard against prodigality and mismanagement, surely such a guard could not be looked for, or entirely relied upon, in disposing of the resources of a great nation. The hon. gent. expressed his intention to vote against the motion.

LORD ARCHIBALD HAMILTON spoke strongly on the opposite side.

MR. WILBERFORCE believing that the proposed investigation would terminate in the exculpation of the two hon. members, still was of opinion, that the House should entertain the proposition of the hon. mover. The public confidence and support were at all times desirable, but at a moment of danger from without and dissatisfaction from within, that House was bound to pursue a strictly just and honourable course. *To refuse the motion of that night was to afford a strong illustration of the necessity of that Reform,* which it was idly supposed could be best checked by a determination not to enter upon inquiry.—Viewing the case in a moral view—[The cries of *Question! question! Withdraw!* were so frequent and continued, that it was impossible to hear the remaining observations of the rt. hon. gent.]—only that he concluded with his determination of supporting the motion of the hon. gent. (Mr. Madocks).

MR. CANNING, in a very eloquent harangue, called upon the House that night TO MAKE A STAND AGAINST THE ENCROACHMENTS OF THE FACIOUS, and to reflect upon the system of which this motion formed a part, dexterously introduced as it was. To-night it was called upon to make an *immolation* of two upon his side of the House, and, perhaps, if successful now, it would on the morrow be summoned to sacrifice two stately victims from the other. (*Hear, hear!*) He argued

the right of canvassing the motives and appreciating the conduct of public meetings, when such meetings were protruded upon the judgment of that House, as speaking the popular will, although never legitimately convened, either according to the spirit or the forms of the constitution. The rt. hon. gent., although persuaded that exculpation would be the consequence of inquiry into the conduct of his two rt. hon. colleagues, of one of whom (Mr. Pereeval) he would say that *his private virtue and public integrity were acknowledged by his friends, and admitted even by his political opponents to be without a stain*) still he thought the House bound to negative the motion, as well for its avowed object as for the consequences to which it would lead. He then concluded with *a florid panegyric upon the House of Commons*, to whatever causes, whether arrangement or chance, it owed its present constitution.

MR. HUTCHINSON protested against the doctrine of that night, which posterity would reprobate. When it should hear that a House of Commons was found so debased as to acknowledge the existence of corruption in its formation, and justify the existence of it. (*Cries of withdraw, withdraw, and violent uproar*). It was at least consistent for those, said the hon. member, *to drown*, if possible, the discussion of men who opposed them. Convinc'd, as they must be, that such conduct as they pursued that night, could neither bear inquiry, argument, or the touchstone of common integrity.

MR. WM. SMITH thought the House bound to reflect upon the alledged interference of lord Castlereagh, with the vote of Mr. Dick upon *a judicial question* of high importance. [*No, No, from the Ministerial benches*]. If the fact be not so, why not inquire? [*No, No, from the same quarter*]. I repeat the words—if the fact be not so, *why not inquire?* and if with the question thus put to you, you refuse to inquire, *the country will not fail to form its own decision.*

MR. PETER MOORE stated, that on a former occasion, when he opposed himself to the general motion of a noble lord (Folkestone), because it did not state some definite grounds, he had then the honour of being cheered by his Majesty's Ministers and their adherents. Their objection then was,—your motion is *too wide-wasting*, *too indefinite*, and therefore we oppose it; but give us something in a tangi-

ble shape and we will withdraw our resistance? *Here then was something in a tangible shape; here was specific corruption offered to be proved* against two members of their body, in confidential situations under the Crown. How has it been received? *Shame to say, its existence has not only been admitted from time immemorial, but even justified from both sides of the House.* Let the House cautiously reflect how it sends abroad such principles, sanctioned by their decision. In such an attempt to vindicate the character of the two rt. hon. gentlemen, they will fail to retrieve them, whilst they sacrifice to eternity the honour, the credit, and the character of the House of Commons.

MR. MADOCKS made a brief reply, defended the consistency of his public life and the purity of his motives. He felt impelled to the course by the sense of public duty, *from which, not even the conduct of that night should succeed in warping him.* A right hon. gent. (Mr. Windham) had confessed, that corruption existed from the top to the bottom of the state. He was sorry to agree with the right hon. gent. on this point. It did, indeed exist most generally. Its universality and ubiquity were frightful, and reminded him of Virgil's figure of Fame:

‘Ingriditurque solo, et caput inter nubila condit.’

The Question being loudly called for, strangers were ordered to withdraw. We understand that the two Amendments were negatived without a division. The House then divided on the original motion, as proposed by Mr. Madocks,—when the numbers were:—

NOES - -	310
AYES - -	85
<hr/>	
MAJORITY AGAINST INQUIRY	225
<hr/>	

#### LIST OF THE MINORITY.

Adams, Charles	Cochrane, Lord
Althorp, Viscount	Coombe, Harvey Christ.
Antonie, William Lee	Cooke, Bryan
Astley, Sir J. H.	Creevey, Thomas
Babington, Thomas	Curwen, John Christian
Barham, Joseph Foster	Dickenson, William
Baring, Alexander	Dundas, Charles
Biddulph, R. Myddleton	Fellowes, Hon. Newton
Bradshaw, Hon. Aug. Cav.	Fitzpatrick, Rt. Hon. Rd.
Brand, Hon. Thomas	Forbes, Viscount
Browne, Anthony	Giles, Daniel
Burke, Sir Francis	Gower, Earl
Byng, George	Grant, Charles
Culver, Nichol on	Ghattan, Rt. Hon. Henry

Halsey, Joseph	Mosley, Sir Oswald
Hamilton, Lord Archibald	Mostyn, Sir Thomas
Hibbert, George	North, Dudley
Hollywood, William	Northey, William
Horner, Francis	Ossulston, Lord
Howard, Henry	Parnell, Henry
Howorth, Humphry	Pelham, Hon. Ch. Add.
Hughes, William Lewis	Percy, Earl
Hutchinson, Hon. C. H.	Porchester, Lord
Hossey, William	Pym, Francis
Jekyll, Joseph	Romilly, Sir Samuel
Johnes, Thomas	Savage, Francis
King, Sir John Dashwood	Scudamore, Rich. Philip
Knapp, George	Sharp, Richard
Launce, Hon. William	Shepley, William
Lambton, Ralph John	Smith, William
Langton, William Gore	St. Aubyn, Sir John
Lemon, Sir William	Symonds, Thomas Powel
Lemon, John	Talbot, Richard Wogan
Lloyd, Sir Edw. Pryce	Thornton, Henry
Lyttleton, Hon. Wm. H.	Tracey, Cha. Hanbury
McDonald, James	Walpole, Hon. George
Markham, John	Western, Charles Callis
Martin, Henry	Wharton, John
Maule, Hon. William	Whitbread, Samuel
Mildmay, Sir Harry	Wilberforce, William
Miller, Sir Thomas	Wardle, Gwylym Lloyd
Milner, Sir W. Mordaunt	
Milton, Lord Viscount	
Moore, Peter	

## TO

THE INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

## LETTER II.

## PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

## Introductory Address.

## GENTLEMEN,

AT our last County-Meeting, we resolved, with only *eight* or *ten* dissenting voices out of about *two thousand* of the most respectable men in this county, that it would be expedient for us to meet on a future day to consider of the propriety of a Petition to the King, praying His Majesty to be graciously pleased to afford us his royal countenance and support in obtaining a reformation in the Commons' House of Parliament; and, as I look forward with confident hope, that that Meeting will take the matter seriously in hand, I think it may be useful, in the meanwhile, for me to submit to you my opinions upon that interesting and important subject.

This I propose to do in the present and future Letters; and, here, at the outset, I think it due to you and to this great cause of the country to declare, that I shall, at all times, be ready to insert whatever may be sent to me, in the way of *answer* to what I shall address to you; thus securing to truth the fairest possible chance of success, by giving, through the same

channel in which my Letters will circulate, circulation to the opinions of those, who may differ from me. This has been the invariable practice of my political life. But, in order to confine the discussion within reasonable bounds, I must notify, that those who may be disposed to answer me must confine themselves to the subject; must state in the head of their performances, which of my letters they are answering, and must take the paragraphs regularly, one after another, as I shall arrange and number them; and must confine themselves, as to space, so as not to exceed, in any instance, *double* the length of that which they profess to answer. Those who may chose to enter this field of controversy, will, of course, keep copies of what they send to me; and, if I find any thing not connected with the subject, I will state it, whereupon they may make the necessary curtailments. I take these precautions, because I would not involve this interesting subject in confusion, which, to truth, is not much less an enemy than is falsehood itself.

We should enter upon this discussion with minds unheated by any thing that has recently transpired; and, above all things, we should subdue in us any thing like *a spirit of revenge*. I am ready, and I have conversed with no man who is not ready, to say: "What is done cannot be undone: let there be no thought of vengeance for the past: let all that has been done be forgotten for ever, and let no one meet with any punishment or reproach on account of it, provided we now have that which shall *effectually* prevent the recurrence of such things for the future." And, indeed, if you consult history, you will find, that, amongst nations as well as amongst individuals, it is not the original and naked offence so much as a pertinacity in defending, or persevering in, it, that inspires the offended with that thirst for vengeance, which, though it may bring calamity upon the offended as well as the offender, does very seldom fail to prove destructive to the former.

Nor, if our deliberations should conclude with an unanimous decision in favour of Reform, should we, in my opinion, be too *hasty* in our expectations. All changes of great national importance require time. That which is done in great haste, is seldom well done. Improvement in all things generally proceeds by degrees; and, though we have here the book of the constitution for our guide,

complete restoration, any more than creation, cannot be expected to be the work of a single effort. When we confront the practice with the theory of our government, which we have, at all times, a right to do, we must, of course, make a lumping appeal from the one to the other; but, when we set about the work of restoration, we must, if we mean to succeed, first remove that which we find to be most injurious and most hostile to the principles of the constitution; and thus pursue our course, till all the *essential* evils be removed.

A remark or two seems necessary here, in answer to the insinuation, and, indeed the open accusation, against all those, who stand prominently forward in the cause of Reform: it is this, that they wish for confusion; for the annihilation of property; and for uproar and bloodshed.—This, Gentlemen, has always been the charge against all those, who have had the courage to take the lead in endeavouring to root out corruption. From the nature of things, it is a charge that must be preferred against such men; because the corrupt will naturally seek to disarm those who attack them, and, it being impossible (or, at least, it has always appeared so till now) to say that *corruption is right*, there is no mode of attacking its assailants, other than that of representing them as wishing for confusion and uproar, by which representations, the uninformed are misled and the timid are frightened. By this mode, this nation has long been deceived, and alarmed. Posterity will, I hope, hardly believe; I hope, that our children will hardly credit the true history of the delusions and alarms of the last fifteen years, during several of which the Act of Habeas Corpus, or Personal Safety Act, stood repealed, and any man was liable to be sent to prison, and there to be kept for years, without a trial and without a hearing; nay, many men were so imprisoned. And what was all this for? Why was this suspension of that great law, without which, in fact, the English government is no better than the old government of France? Why, because the nation was *alarmed*; because it was persuaded that certain Clubs and Societies would destroy all property, when what those Clubs demanded, though they might do it indiscreetly, was, in truth, no more than what Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Richmond, had themselves demanded, and had represented as necessary to the safety of the nation, many years before. The disgraceful days of alarm are, indeed, now passed; and, I

think, it will be very difficult for the friends of corruption to cause their return; but, still they harp upon the *dangers* of change, though they cannot deny, that the change would be for the better; and still, though we ask only for the restoration of *a part* of the well-known and long-tried constitution of England, as relating to the House of Commons; still they accuse us of a wish to introduce confusion, uproar and bloodshed. But, who are these accusers? Those who accused Mr. Wardle; those who denounced him to the nation as the tool of a Jacobin Conspiracy; those who have been detected in the misapplication of the public money, and in the worst sorts of corruption; these are the persons, who attribute to us a wish to destroy all property, and to introduce uproar and bloodshed. In short, if we would form a correct opinion of these efforts to excite new alarm; if we would form a correct opinion of the views of those, who raise these impudent calumnies against our cause, we have only to bear in mind, that JOHN BOWLES was the first who accused Englishmen of *Jacobinism*; that the REV. DR. O'MEARA, from under the wing of Mrs. Clarke, preached before the king against *Democracy*; and that the REV. MR. BEAZLEY, who tendered a bribe to the Duke of Portland to make him Dean of Salisbury, wrote a pamphlet upon the approaching *dangers of Popery*.—Such are the *alarmists*; and, if you bear this fact in mind, you will have very little difficulty in deciding as to what are now the real grounds of alarm.

Besides, who and what are the persons, who stand most prominently exposed to this accusation? SIR FRANCIS BURDETT, MR. MADOCKS, MR. WARDLE, and LORD COCKRANE. These are the only members of the House of Commons, who, as yet, have taken a *decided* and active part in the cause. And, are you to be made to believe, that these four gentlemen, or either of them, can wish ill to their country? That they, who have, all of them, such large portions of property, wish to see all property destroyed? Or, are you to be made to believe, that they, who have so much talent; so much knowledge and so much of mind in every other respect, are, upon this subject, fools? The thing is not to be believed by any man in his senses.

With respect to myself, I should certainly not trouble you, were it not my opinion that it may be useful, in this Introductory Address, to give you an instance of the behaviour of my opponent writers.—

Some of you will have heard, perhaps, that while I was in America, I wrote several pamphlets, some under a feigned name, and some under no name at all.—From one of these pamphlets, the London ministerial newspapers have extracted these words: “For my part, I am no friend of the English; I wish their island was sunk to the bottom of the sea.” Having taken this sentence, they tell their readers, that it is quite natural “such a person” should wish for a Reform that would lead to revolution.—Gentlemen, I do not recollect any thing so bad as this, ever done, or attempted to be done, by any writer in the world.—The pamphlet, from which the extract is made, was written for the purpose, and the sole purpose, of serving my king and country, and that, too, at a time and in a place, when and where no man but myself had the zeal to write a line for such a purpose. In order to give effect to what I was writing, it was necessary for me to say something to disguise the fact, that it proceeded from an *Englishman's* pen; and, that this was the case, there needs no proof but this, that the government at home caused this pamphlet to be republished in England. Further, for having written this and other pamphlets in America, the government here made me offers of their support, which I never accepted of. Upon my return from America those offers were renewed, but again rejected. I received marks of approbation, for these writings, from all the men then in power. I dined at Mr. Windham's with Pitt, which I then thought a very great honour; and, really, when Mr. Canning looks back to the time, when I dined at his house at Putney, and when he paid me so many just compliments for my exertions in my country's cause, I can hardly think, that he must not view with some degree of shame these attempts on the part of persons, who are publicly said to write under his particular patronage. As to Mr. Windham, he has declared, in open parliament, that, for my writings in America, I deserved a statue of gold.—Judge you, then, of the candour, the truth, the honesty, of the writers, who oppose Parliamentary Reform; and, as yet, I have seen it opposed by no writer, who is not of this description. Judge you of the motives of such men; judge you of the nature of that cause, in support of which such means are resorted to; judge you how strong my adversaries must think me in fact, in argument, and in character, when they are driven to the employment of means like these.—I have not trou-

bled you with this statement by the way of *complaint*; for, indeed, such things cannot fail to have a good effect, with all sensible men, and to such only do I address myself. The man, who takes upon him to write on politics, necessarily exposes himself to misrepresentations and calumnies of all sorts; especially if his object be to spoil the trade of the corrupt and the venal. It is his inevitable lot; but, he has always this consoling and encouraging reflection; that his adversaries, with a strict regard to the rules of proportion, are sure to adapt the measure of their anger to the magnitude of his success, and of their consequent dread of his future exertions. The greatest compliment that can possibly be paid to any writer, is, to answer his argument by an attack upon his person; and, the next is, that of appealing to his opinions, formerly expressed, especially under a total change of circumstances, whether as to the things themselves or the information relating to them. This last species of attack has been made most liberal use of against me. Just as if opinions formed and expressed, when I was not much more than half as old as I now am, and when I had, in fact, had no *experience* at all, were to invalidate, or have any weight, against the arguments that I now have to offer. Because I praised Mr. Pitt, when I was in America, or upon my return, does it follow that I was to continue to praise him after being some years a near witness of his conduct, and after having seen it proved, that he lent, without interest, £10,000*l.* of the public money, to two members of the *House of Commons*, without any authority for so doing, and even without communicating the fact to his colleagues. When I saw this come to light, and when I saw him take a *bill of indemnity*, (that is, a law to screen him from punishment) for this, as well as for other acts of his administration: when I saw this, was I still to praise him? Or, if I did it not, was I to be accused of inconsistency?—This was the drift of Mr. POUWER's personalities at Winchester, and of the hand-bills, which, on that morning had been posted up in the Inns and other places of the city, and all which you treated with that contempt, which they so well merited.—Such attempts, when made upon men of sense, always fail of their intended effect, and are sure to recoil, with tenfold force, upon those who make use of them. Any attack upon me, if it come in a credible shape, I am at all times ready to answer, and am *certain* that I shall beat my

adversary ; but, having thus exposed to your view the means by which the enemies of Parliamentary Reform have hitherto endeavoured to excite a prejudice against one of its principal literary advocates, I shall not, hereafter, suffer the discussion to be encumbered with any thing not immediately belonging to the subject ; I shall not suffer myself to be lured from the important points at issue by any thing whatever relating personally to me.

There is one more topic, upon which I think it may be necessary to say a few words in this introductory address, and even before I come to lay down the heads and the order of the discussion. I allude to the *cry*, with which every attempt to obtain a Reform of the Parliament is, upon all occasions, met by those who have so manifest an interest in preventing such Reform. The cry is this : " What, you " want a REVOLUTION, do you ; " and, then they fall to a description of the horrors of the FRENCH REVOLUTION.

Gentlemen, I do not think that you, or that any part, or any one, of my readers can be so weak as to be swayed by a fallacy so palpable as this ; but, it may not, upon this occasion, be amiss to give it an exposure in detail, in order to see whether those, who make use of it, have in them any remains of shame.

There was a *revolution* in France, which produced great calamities and horrors, and, therefore, we are desired to believe, that *all* revolutions must produce calamities and horrors ; and this doctrine, too, is preached to us from the very same lips whence proceed endless *praises* of the revolution in England, which placed the House of Brunswick upon the throne.

Supposing, however, all political revolutions to be very mischievous ; supposing all changes in the succession to thrones, in the forms of governments, in the distribution of the powers in a nation ; supposing all these to be, at all times, mischievous, the supposition, though a very wild one, would not bear against the cause of Reform in Parliament, because we, who wish for that Reform, neither propose, nor wish for, *any thing new*. We want nothing but the sincere profession and the faithful observance of what is *already* the constitution of England, as laid down, and clearly laid down *in the books of our laws*. To set up against us, therefore, the cry of *revolution*, can, I am confident, have, with men of sense, no other effect than that of adding one more to the numerous proofs, which we already possess,

of the insincerity of the enemies of Reform.

But, let us *patiently*, if possible, inquire a little into the grounds of the monstrous supposition, that, because confusion and bloodshed took place in France some years ago, in consequence of the changes there made, the same must take place here if a reform in the House of Commons be adopted.—What *similarity*, let me first ask, is there in the two cases ? In France the government was despotic ; any man could, at any time, be sent to prison, and there kept for life, without trial and without hearing ; the laws were in fact made by the king's sole will, there were no juries to try causes of any sort ; the feudal system was still in such vigour as to make it a crime, in many places, for people to grind their own corn or bake their own bread, being compelled to carry the materials to the mill and to the oven of the Lord of the Manor, paying him a heavy tax for the grinding or the baking. Endless would be the points of contrast ; but, for our present purpose, it is quite sufficient to state merely this, that the French had no *legislative assembly* ; nobody of persons, who, as to the making of laws, had any share of authority. In France, what was proposed to be effected, was a total change in the very nature of the government ; the thing set about was the making of a *government of a new sort*, and, of course, taking the old one to pieces, from top to bottom. It was not, therefore, very wonderful, that, from the resistance of the feudal Lords as from the crown, great anger should be engendered, and deadly strife arise ; and, especially when the numerous noblesse, instead of yielding their oppressive privileges, and endeavouring to assist the people with their advice, flew with eagerness to join an army of foreigners, called by them for the purpose of compelling the people to submit to their authority, and to prevent the redress of what all the world acknowledged to be grievances that no human beings ought to support, and the refusal, the obstinate refusal, to consent to any measure, which shoudl prevent the return of which, was the cause, and the sole cause, of that sway which bloody and impious men afterwards obtained, and by the means of which sway so many foolish and wicked and cruel acts were committed. But what has all this, or any part of it, to do with our question of *Reform in Parliament* ? Does that measure contemplate any one of those objects that were in the contemplation of the French ? Have

we any feudal Lords to whose mills and ovens we are compelled to carry our corn and our flour? Have we not juries already? Have we not laws (while we keep them *unsuspended*) which prevent arbitrary imprisonment? And, have we not Houses of Legislators, without whose consent no laws can be passed? Do we, like the French, stand in need of a change in the nature of the government; of the abolition of the old powers and the erection of new ones; and, in short, of a new sort of government, from top to bottom? You know, Gentlemen; all the world must know, that we stand in need of no such thing; and that there is not, in the whole nation, one single man, capable of obtaining half a score of adherents, who entertains so mad a notion. We, as I said before, want *nothing new*. We have no schemes or projects; all that we want is that share in the government, which the constitution gives us, and of which we think ourselves not at present in possession, owing to the abuses, which have, by degrees, crept into the Representation in Parliament. This is all we want; and, because we want this, we are accused of wishing for *Revolution*, and our adversaries, the friends of corruption, having neither fact nor argument wherewith to oppose to us, hold out to those whom they think themselves able to deceive and terrify, the "dreadful consequences of the Revolution" "in France," than which a more gross attempt at imposition, surely, never was made.

That this attempt will not succeed I am perfectly satisfied. I am convinced, that, sooner or later, and the sooner from the absence of every thing like *violence* or *haste*, the measure of Reform will and must be adopted. Nay, the Bill of Mr. Curwen, now before the House of Commons, (and which Bill will, to all appearance, pass in that House) completely recognizes the main principle, upon which we proceed; namely, that Seats in that House ought not to be obtained by corrupt practices, and that votes in it ought not to be paid for, either in money or in money's worth. In the introduction and entertaining of this Bill, the House itself acknowledges, that we have good grounds of complaint on the score of representation; the House itself acknowledges, that, to a certain extent, at least, *Parliamentary Reform is necessary*; and, therefore, it would be full as just to accuse the House of *Revolutionary* intentions, as to prefer that accusation against us, who, out of the House, wish for that Reform.

Having endeavoured to place in a clear light the fallacy, not to give it any worse name, of the general objections, or, rather, the out-cries, which have been raised against a Reform in the Representation of the People, in the House of Commons, I propose, in my succeeding letters, to discuss the following questions: I. Whether the present state of the Representation be consonant with that constitution, which has so long been the boast of Englishmen. II. What sort of Reform ought to be made. III. Whether the nation would be benefitted, and, if so, in what way, by such Reform. IV. Whether the present be a proper time for making such Reform. —These, gentlemen, it appears to me, are the only questions that we have to discuss and to decide upon; and, if we discuss and decide upon them without passion, I have no hesitation to say, that your decision will be the decision of the nation, and that, at no distant day, if your acts correspond with your opinions, if you steadily and ardently, but, above all things, *steadily*, persevere, in your constitutional efforts to obtain your object, that object will be obtained. I am,

Your friend,

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, 16th May, 1809.

#### WILTSHIRE MEETING.

I am sorry, that it is out of my power to give a full account of this Meeting, which was held at the city of SALISBURY, on the 17th instant, and at which a Resolution was passed, in substance, as to most parts, like that passed in Hampshire, but, substituting for the interesting *declaration* of Mr. CREEVEY, the still more interesting and more authentic record of the *motion* of Mr. MADOCKS, and the *decision* of the House thereon.—For this Resolution I have not, in the present number, room to insert. It will, of course, have its place with those passed in other counties.—The Meeting was very numerous and respectable, there being certainly above 1,500 persons present.—The 1st Resolution was moved by MR. HUNT of Enford, at the close of a very able, an argumentative and an eloquent speech. It was seconded by MR. COLLINS, one of the corporation of Salisbury, in a manner to be naturally expected from a gentleman, who, I understand, has long been universally looked up to for talent, as well as for public spirit. A second Resolution, passing censure upon the two county members, was moved by MR. BLEEKE of Warminster, who, in this

his first essay, afforded to the “persons of ‘consequence,’” in the county, a pretty good proof, that talents are not wanted, amongst the yeomanry, when occasion calls them forth. — These “persons of consequence” did, we have been told, keep away, lest, by their presence, they should give weight to the proceedings. Now, it appears to me, that the natural thing for them to do would have been to come to the Meeting, and convince us of their consequence; make us feel their weight, by opposing, and setting aside, the Resolutions, moved and seconded by persons of “no ‘consequence.’”—If those “persons of ‘consequence’” approved of thanks to Mr. Wardle, and yet did not like to see the business in the hands of persons of “no ‘consequence,’” why did they not take it in hand themselves? Oh, no! They did not approve of such thanks. That is very clear; and, it is equally clear, that they knew that the county in general did approve of them.—Let me take the liberty to tell these “persons of consequence” that, it seems to me, that they are in a fair way of losing their consequence, unless they very soon begin to bestir themselves; for, they will be so good as to excuse me, if I think it the oddest of all possible ways of keeping up their consequence, to let the world see that they are afraid to face those, whom they represent as possessed of no consequence at all.—Say what they will about the matter, the county will want no one to tell them, that nothing but conscious weakness could induce them, upon such an occasion, to keep away. This is what the whole county will be well satisfied of, and that being the case, the ultimate effect, as to themselves, it is by no means difficult to foresee.—The High Sheriff, Sir CHARLES MALLER, who appears to be a very clever man, conducted the business of the day in a very fair and impartial manner.—It was said, in the morning, that there were several gentlemen, come with a firm resolution, to oppose the vote of thanks; but, the result shewed, that, either they became converts themselves, or despaired of making proselytes; for, not a man opened his lips in the way of opposition. With their hats, indeed, a very few expressed their dissent; but, the decision was of that sort, which may be fairly called unanimous. There was a little of division upon the question of censure of the two county members; but, it was very small; and, indeed, the impression produced by the whole of the proceedings, was, that this county, so long apparently

dead, and in which there had not been a County-Meeting for thirty years, was beginning to rouse from its lethargy.—The whole of the Proceedings were taken down by MR. WILLETT, a gentleman connected with the London news-paper, the STATESMAN, whose unsolicited attendance was gratefully acknowledged by a numerous company of gentlemen, who, after the Meeting was over, assembled at dinner. Indeed, this paper, which is published in the evening, and which, therefore, is convenient for the country, deserves the particular encouragement of all those, who are enemies to corruption and friends to reform. It is the only London news-paper, that I have heard of, which has shown any disposition to do full justice to the County-Meetings; and, those who are sincere in any public cause, should always make a point to support, in every way that they are able, that part of the Press, which stands forward in that cause.—For this reason, as well as for the sake of more extensive circulation, I shall take care, that the proprietor of the STATESMAN has an opportunity of publishing my letters upon *Parliamentary Reform*, on the same day, on which they are published in the Register; so that those, who take an Evening Paper, and do not take the Register, may avail themselves, if they think it worth their while, of the means of possessing these Letters in the Statesman.

#### MR. PALMER'S CLAIM.

\* This question, which is, I perceive, to come on for discussion, in the House of Commons, on the 25th instant, had escaped my attention until it was too late to enter upon it in a manner that would be worthy of such a question. My intention was to have compared Mr. Palmer's Claim, and the objections made to it, with the sums lavished upon many others, and the reasons, or, rather, the no reasons, by which the granting of such such sums are attempted to be justified. Mr. Palmer's services the whole nation feels and acknowledges; and yet his Claim has been denied, while advocates in abundance are found for the sinecures of the Seymours and the Garniers and the Pensions of the Pagets! But, let us hope, that, after what has come to light, there will, at least, be found a disposition to grant this claim. I have never met with any man, who did not wish to see it granted. This is a case, in which the nation most anxiously wishes to part with its money. How much have we heard, in other cases, of not being niggardly! How

much have we heard, in other cases, of the "liberty of a great nation?" How much have we heard, in other cases, of the reward due to national services! Aye, and in cases, too, where it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to make the existence of those services evident to any common understanding. Mr. Palmer demands bare justice; the bare fulfilment of the contract, on the part of the public, he having fulfilled his part of it, and that, too, at his own risk; a contract, according to which he was *sure to lose*, unless the public *gained*; such a contract as no man ever, before or since, made with the public, and such a contract as few men, after his fate, will be tempted to imitate.

*Salisbury, 18th May, 1809.*

#### PROCEEDINGS

*In COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &c. relative to the recent INQUIRY in the House of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK. (Continued from p. 736.*

#### TOWN OF LIVERPOOL.

At a Meeting of the Friends of Constitutional Freedom and Enemies of Political Corruption, held at the Globe Tavern, Liverpool, April 21, 1809.—George Williams, esq. in the Chair.

It was Resolved, that the grateful Thanks of this Meeting are due to G. L. Wardle, esq. for the undaunted, firm and patriotic manner in which he brought forward and prosecuted the late Inquiry into the conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York; a measure which has not only occasioned the removal of his Royal Highness from Office, but by having opened the eyes of the Country to the conduct of their Representatives, is likely to be productive of the happiest and most important consequences to the nation at large.

Resolved, That the practice of persons holding Offices or enjoying Pensions under the Crown, and having at the same time a Seat in the Commons House of Parliament as Representatives of the People, although it has been guarded against by our ancestors with peculiar jealousy, has now arisen to an alarming excess; and that it is become highly expedient to resort to those methods for remedying the evil which have formerly been adopted by the Legislature of this Country, and to use our endeavours to obtain the entire exclusion of Placemen and Pensioners from the House of Commons.

Resolved, that the sending of Members to Parliament, by places where the popu-

lation is so far diminished as to render them liable to corrupt practices and undue influence, whilst other towns and places, of great importance and considerable population, do not enjoy such right, is inconsistent with the spirit of the Constitution, and is a defect introduced by inattention and lapse of time, which ought to be speedily and effectually remedied.

Resolved, that a letter be written to Mr. Wardle, testifying the deep sense which this Meeting entertains of his great and meritorious services, and that the same be signed by the Persons now present, and be left for the signature of such other Inhabitants of the town and neighbourhood of Liverpool as may think proper to subscribe the same.

Resolved, that the Thanks of this Meeting are also due to sir F. Burdett, bart. who seconded and supported the Motion of Mr. Wardle; to lord Folkestone, and S. Whitbread, esq. by whose able and strenuous exertions, through a long and intricate investigation, the nation is indebted for the fullest information on this subject; and to lord Stanley, sir S. Romilly, gen. Ferguson, T. W. Coke, esq. J. C. Curwen, esq. and the other Members of the House of Commons, who, by the manly avowal of their sentiments, and their conscientious and unbiassed votes, have evinced their integrity and independence.

Resolved, that the Thanks of this Meeting are due to Wm. Roscoe, esq. for proposing the Address to G. L. Wardle, esq. and the above Resolutions, which have been unanimously adopted by this Meeting.

Resolved, that this Meeting views with great regret and just indignation the refusal of the Mayor to call a Meeting of the Inhabitants to take into consideration those public proceedings in which the best interests and most valued rights of their Country were deeply involved, and that it is the opinion of this Meeting that the Inhabitants be convened to exercise those privileges which are secured to them by the laws of their Country, without any further application to the Mayor.

#### BOROUGH OF IPSWICH.

THE Portmen of the Borough of Ipswich, at whose instance a Great Court was held April 21, for the purpose of returning Thanks to Lieut. Col. Wardle, for his meritorious conduct in Parliament, feel it due to their own character to submit to their Brother-Freemen who were not present in Court, and to the Public at large, a Copy of the Resolution which they

moved on the occasion, that the spirit and temper by which they were guided in the bringing forward of this measure, and that of their Opponents, by whom it was defeated, may be perfectly understood.

"That the Thanks of this Court be given to Lieut. Col. Wardle for his meritorious and patriotic exertions in the House of Commons, by which, gross misconduct in the Chief Direction of the Army has been detected and exposed, and an example set from which the most beneficial consequences may be expected by the loyal Subjects of this Realm in a Reform of those Abuses which tarnish the lustre and impair the energies of our happy and glorious Constitution."

Such was the Resolution, and the only Resolution of a public nature with which they were provided; and having scrupulously avoided in it every thought and every expression which they supposed could possibly give offence to any personal or party feeling, they hoped to have conciliated the concurrence and support of all their Brother-Freemen, and deemed it impossible that sentiments and wishes so perfectly congenial with those of the great Body of the People, could be negatived at a Great Court of the Borough of Ipswich, till they found a Party industriously formed there to frustrate altogether, by noise and tumult, the purpose for which it was convened.

May their opponents longer enjoy the full credit of the victory they gained on the occasion. The Portmen, on their part, are quite content to take to themselves the whole obloquy of bringing forward a measure, which they are satisfied must meet the approbation of all but the miserable tools or dupes of those who thrive on that System of Corruption and Abuse against which it was levelled.—H. Seekamp, John Spooner, W. B. Clarke, Wm. Hammond, John Forest, F. F. Seekamp, Fred. Cornwallis, B. Brame.

#### BOROUGH OF CHIPPING-WYCOMBE.

At a Court of Common Council, held in the Guildhall of the said Borough this 22d day of April, 1809, Samuel Manning, esq. Mayor, in the Chair.

Resolved, That the Thanks of this Meeting be transmitted to G. L. Wardle, esq. for his patriotic conduct in bringing forward and steadily persevering in an inquiry relative to certain Abuses which appear to have existed in Military Promotions tending to the degradation of the Army.

Resolved, That G. L. Wardle, esq. be elected a Burgess of this ancient Corporation.

Resolved, That the Thanks of this Meeting be presented to sir John Dashwood King, Bart. and Thomas Baring, esq. the worthy Representatives of this Borough in Parliament, for their independent conduct on the late Investigation.

Resolved, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir S. Romilly, knt. one of the Burgesses of this Borough, for his able defence of our Constitutional Rights on the late important Question.

Resolved, That such Votes of Thanks be communicated by the Deputy Town Clerk.

#### COUNTY OF MONMOUTH.

At a Meeting of the Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders of the County of Monmouth, convened on April 28, 1809, at the Town Hall in Usk, by the High Sheriff of the said County, in pursuance of a Requisition for that purpose, in order to return the Thanks of the County to G. L. Wardle, esq. for his able and patriotic conduct in bringing forward and investigating the recent Charges against his Royal Highness the Duke of York.

Resolved, That G. L. Wardle, esq. by his firm and persevering exertions on that memorable Inquiry against a host of talents and other great discouragements and difficulties, has deserved well of his country, and that the Thanks of this Meeting be given to him.

That the Thanks of the Meeting be also given to Henry Bankes, esq. for his Amendment, which, by being supported by two hundred and one Members, produced the resignation of the late Commander in Chief, and the Meeting gladly avails itself of this public opportunity of expressing its admiration of, and obligations for, his high-spirited and independent conduct on the formation of the present Finance Committee, and for his essential services as Chairman of the last.

That the Thanks of this Meeting are also due to the Minority on Mr. Wardle's Motion, the Minority of Mr. Bankes' Amendment, the Minority on sir T. Turner's Amendment, and the Minority on Mr. Perceval's Amendment.

That it is the opinion of this Meeting a very considerable number of Placemen and Pensioners who have seats in Parliament, are under the influence of Government, and that a temperate Reform in Parliament is therefore necessary, and that

it is the duty of this County to express its wishes to their representatives, that they would support a strict investigation into the various abuses of the public expenditure.

That the abuses attacked by Col. Wardle and Mr. Banks form only a part of a corrupt system long acted upon, and that no permanent good will arise from the late investigation, unless followed up by a general reformation of the public abuses in many departments of the state.

#### STEWARTRY OF KIRKCUDBRIGHT.

At a General Annual Meeting of the Commissioners of the Land Tax for the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright, April 29, 1809. James Murray McCulloch, Esq. of Ardwall, chosen Preses.—

The Meeting came to the following unanimous Resolutions:—

1st, That the investigation lately made in the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, into the conduct of the late Commander in Chief of the British Army, has discovered gross corruption and abuses in the administration of the military department.

2d, That the Thanks of the County be given to G. L. Wardle, esq. member of Parliament, for the independent spirit with which he undertook, and the great ability and undaunted perseverance with which he conducted, an enquiry, the consequences of which the Meeting trust will be of permanent advantage to the interests of the Country. And,

3d, That the Preses do transmit a copy of these Resolutions to Mr. Wardle; and that the Clerk cause the same to be advertised in the London, Edinburgh, and Dumfries Newspapers.

#### TOWN OF MANCHESTER.

At a very numerous and respectable Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Towns of Manchester and Salford, convened by a Requisition which was signed by upwards of Two Thousand Persons, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of passing a Vote of Thanks to G. L. Wardle, esq. M. P. and to those Members of the House of Commons who so honourably supported him during the late arduous and important Investigation, and held at the Bull's Head Inn, in Manchester, on Wednesday, the 3d day of May, 1809, Robert Philips, esq. in the Chair.

The following Resolutions were unanimously passed:—

That the gross and corrupt practices

which have been proved to exist in various departments of the State have excited in us the deepest regret, and we feel that G. L. Wardle, esq. M. P. by the manly, temperate and impartial manner in which he brought forward his Charges against the late Commander in Chief, and by the zeal, firmness, and intrepidity with which he prosecuted the Inquiry, has faithfully discharged his duty to his country, and does in a high degree merit the Thanks of this Meeting.

That the Thanks of this Meeting are also due to those Members of the House of Commons who so honourably supported col. Wardle during the late arduous and important Investigation.

That the Chairman do transmit these Resolutions to G. L. Wardle, esq.

#### TOWN OF DONCASTER.

At a numerous and respectable Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Town and Neighbourhood of Doncaster, held at this day at the Town-hall, pursuant to a Requisition for that purpose, the Worshipful the Mayor in the Chair :

Resolved unanimously,—1st. That the grateful Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq. for the faithful discharge of his duty in Parliament, by instituting and prosecuting an Inquiry into the conduct of the late Commander in Chief, by which means circumstances have been brought to light highly injurious to the real interests of the Crown, and subversive of the welfare and prosperity of the people.

2d, That the particular Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir F. Burdett, bart. lord Folkestone, Mr. Whitbread, sir S. Romilly, adm. Markham, lord Althorpe, and the rest of the 125 Members who supported Mr. Wardle's motion.

3d, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to all those Members of the House or Commons, who voted in the several Minorities, on the different Divisions, which took place during the late important and patriotic Inquiry.

4th, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the two worthy Representatives of this County, Wm. Wilberforce, esq. and lord visc. Milton, for their honourable and independent conduct in the able support they gave to the recent Investigation.

5th. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to major gen. Ferguson for the honourable, independent and distinguished discharge of his parliamentary duty on the late occasion.

6th, That this Meeting, anxious to preserve unimpaired the purity and blessings of that excellent form of Government, which our ancestors have transmitted to us, and ardently wishing to see all the constituted authorities preserved and revered in the due exercise of their respective functions, feels it to be an indispensable duty at this eventful moment, when all the nations that surround us have paid the forfeit of their corruption in the annihilation of their Government, to call for a strict, a temperate, but an effectual inquiry into every species of public abuse, and to express a hope that hereafter, on similar occasions, the sense of the House of Commons may appear to be less at variance with the sense of the Nation; and that a larger body of the representatives of the people may be found to defend the constitution, by correcting public abuses, so effectually as to secure to the country the honest application and economical expenditure of public money.

7th, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Wm. Wrightson, esq. for the independent, moderate, and truly constitutional manner in which he has expressed his sentiments on the present occasion.

8th, That the County Members be requested to transmit to Mr. Wardle the Thanks of this Meeting as expressed in the first Resolution: and that the Chairman be desired to convey the Thanks of this Meeting to those gentlemen mentioned in the 2d and 5th Resolutions.

#### TOWN OF BEVERLEY.

At a Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Town and Neighbourhood of Beverley, held at the Guildhall, in Beverley, on Wednesday the 3d day of May, 1809, for the purpose of considering a Vote of Thanks to G. L. Wardle, esq. for his patriotic exertions, in instituting and prosecuting the Inquiry into the conduct of his Royal Highness the late Commander in Chief.—Richard Fox, esq. Mayor, in the Chair.

Resolved Unanimously, That this Meeting deeply deplores the too evident existence of abuses and other practices of evil tendency in various branches of Public Affairs, do highly approve of the firm and independent spirit evinced by G. L. Wardle, esq. in instituting and steadily prosecuting the Inquiry into the conduct of the late Commander in Chief, and that by his patriotic exertions he is deservedly entitled to and has the Thanks and Gratitude of this Meeting.

That the Thanks of this Meeting be pre-

sented to John Wharton, esq. one of the Representatives of this Borough, for his support upon the said Inquiry.

That the Thanks of this Meeting be also presented to W. Wilberforce, esq. and Lord Viscount Milton, the Members for this County, together with the Independent Minority, for their votes and exertions on that occasion.

That the Chairman be requested to sign these Resolutions as the act of this Meeting, and to transmit copies thereof to G. L. Wardle, esq. J. Wharton, esq. W. Wilberforce, esq. and Lord Milton.

---

#### COUNTY OF HUNTINGDON.

At a Meeting of the Freeholders of the said County, held at the Shire Hall in Huntingdon, in the said County, on Friday, the fifth day of May, 1809, pursuant to a Requisition to the High Sheriff for that purpose:

Resolved Unanimously, 1. That it is the opinion of this Meeting that the late Investigation by the Honourable House of Commons into the Conduct of the late Commander in Chief, is a matter of infinite importance to this country, inasmuch as it has furnished a strong incitement to that Honourable House to exert themselves to defend the Throne and the People from the destructive effects of Corruption in every department of the State.

2. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq. for his courage, candour, and perseverance in conducting the said Investigation.

3. That this Meeting have seen with much satisfaction the steps taken by the wisdom of Parliament for the suppression of any abuses that may exist in the State, and hope and trust they will continue their exertions until the same shall be effectually reformed.

---

#### TOWN OF GUILDFORD.

At a Meeting of the inhabitants of Guildford, held in the Town-hall, the 25th of April 1809.

Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq. for instituting an Inquiry against the late Commander in Chief, which has led to the discovery of certain abuses highly injurious to fair and honourable promotion in the Army, and detrimental to the public service.

Resolved, That the Resolutions and Address be signed by the Mayor, and presented by him to G. L. Wardle, esq. and

that the same be inserted in the Courier and County Herald.

An ADDRESS of the Inhabitants of the Town, assembled on the same day and place.

“ To G. L. WARDLE, Esq. M. P.

“ SIR; — We consider that no foreign conquest or efforts of genius are so essential to the Country as the honest exertions of Independent Members of Parliament, to expose, and endeavour to exterminate, corrupt practices.

“ We revere our King and Constitution, and complain of no sacrifices that we are called upon for their security and support; but when such transactions as have lately been exposed are suffered to exist without notice, how truly thankful must every true and loyal Briton be that such an independent Member as yourself stands forward as Champion in the cause of Truth.

“ We most ungrudgingly give you our cordial and grateful thanks, and most sincerely wish that you may for many years enjoy the heart-felt satisfaction of being instrumental to the happiness of your own Countrymen.—J. MARTYR, Mayor.”

COUNTY OF NORFOLK.

At a most numerous and respectable Meeting of the Freeholders of the County of Norfolk, held at the Shire-house, on Tuesday, the 2d of May, 1809, the following Resolutions were moved by the hon. George Herbert (who was called to the Chair in the absence of the High Sheriff) seconded by Thomas Beevor, esq. and adopted without one dissentient voice:

Resolved, 1. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq. for the indefatigable zeal and disinterested patriotism he has evinced in detecting and bringing to light the gross and unparalleled Corruption which has long existed in the office of the Commander in Chief; and for the firm and temperate perseverance with which (in defiance of threats and difficulties) he carried on the late Investigation in Parliament, to his own honour, and the advantage of his Country.

2. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to all those who cordially assisted Mr. Wardle in the arduous task he had undertaken, shewing themselves at once the Friends of the People and the Enemies of Corruption—especially to sir F. Burdett, lord Folkestone, S. Whitbread, esq. sir S. Romilly, sir T. Turton, J. C. Curwen, esq. C. W. Wynne, esq. major-general Ferguson, and adm. Markham.

3. That the Thanks of this Meeting

are in an especial manner due to our worthy Representative, T. W. Coke, esq. who divided with the patriotic minority of 125, in favour of Mr. Wardle's Motion; and for the firm and manly manner in which he delivered his own sentiments, and those of the People in general; thereby proving himself worthy of the confidence that has been so long reposed in him by the Freeholders of this County.

4. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to our other Representative, sir J. H. Astley, bart. for his vote in favour of sir T. Turton's amendment.

5. That it is the earnest hope of this Meeting, that the truly patriotic example of Mr. Wardle may stimulate others to exert themselves in their duty to their Constituents, by eradicating Corruption from every branch of the Government and Legislature.

6. That the Majority in the late divisions in Parliament, acquitting the Commander in Chief of all personal Corruption, and of all Connivance at Corruption, was in direct opposition to the sense of the People; and that the necessity is thereby evinced of adopting some effectual Reform, in order that the voice of the Representatives may become the voice of the People.

7. That it is the decided opinion of this Meeting, that no substantial and permanent good can be derived by the Country from any change of Ministers, unless accompanied by an entire change of system; and that the most certain method of rendering Parliamentary Reform effectual is, to follow the laudable example of Westminster, by returning, free of expence, such representatives as are worthy of confidence; and by shortening the duration of Parliaments, in order that a frequent appeal to the sense of the People may guide the conduct of our Representatives, without increasing their expences.

8. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the gentlemen who signed the Requisition.

9. That those Resolutions be inserted in the Norwich Papers, the Ipswich and Bury Papers, and the London Papers.

The following Resolutions were also moved by John Kerrich, esq. seconded by the hon. George Herbert, and adopted with equal unanimity:

10. That a Subscription be entered into by the Freeholders of the County of Norfolk, to purchase a Piece of Plate, which shall be presented to Mr. Wardle in their Names.

11. That the Gentlemen who signed the Requisition to the High Sheriff for this Meeting be requested to act as a Committee for the application of the Funds arising from the Subscriptions, and that they be authorised to present the Plate to Mr. Wardle, in any way, and with any inscription they may deem explanatory of the intention of the donors.

12. That the Subscription do finally close in the coming Summer Assize Week, and the purposes for which it was entered into be then proceeded upon by the Committee with all convenient dispatch.

13. That the Bankers in Norfolk and Suffolk, and Messrs. Barclays, Tritton and Bevan, Lombard-street, be requested to receive any subscription, not exceeding Two Guineas.

#### BOROUGH OF BOSTON.

At a numerous and respectable Meeting of the Inhabitants of this Borough, convened by advertisement, at the White Hart Inn, this day, May 9, 1809, for the purpose of considering of the propriety of voting an Address of Thanks to G. L. Wardle, esq. for his recent conduct in Parliament,

Abraham Sheath, esq. in the Chair: The following Resolutions were carried with only one dissenting voice:

Resolved, 1. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq. for his manly and independent Conduct in Parliament during the recent Investigation of the Charges brought against the Commander in Chief, and thereby exposing various Abuses in the Military Department in the State.

2. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the Patriotic Minority of 125, who supported Colonel Wardle, in his arduous undertaking in the House of Commons, shewing themselves at once the Friends of the People, and the Enemies of Corruption.

3. That the Thanks of this Meeting are due to W. A. Madocks, esq. one of the Representatives of this Borough, and to the hon. C. A. Pelham, one of the Representatives of this County, for their Votes on this important Question.

4. That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that it will be highly expedient that the strictest inquiries into the several Departments of the State be still farther prosecuted by the House of Commons, being fully convinced that no change of Ministers, unless accompanied by an entire change of system, can be of essential

service to the Interests and Welfare of the Country.

#### COUNTY OF HERTFORD.

At a Meeting of the Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders of the County of Hertford, held at the Shire Hall, at Hertford, in the same county, on the 13th of May, 1809, convened by the High Sheriff, in consequence of a Requisition addressed to him for the purpose of expressing their sense of the conduct of their representatives in Parliament with respect to the Charges, against his Royal Highness the late Commander in Chief, and their sentiments upon the corrupt practices which have been brought to light by the evidence which has been given in the House of Commons upon the investigation of those Charges,—The High Sheriff in the Chair:

Resolved, That the Parliamentary Investigation into the Conduct of the late Commander in Chief, and the result of other Parliamentary Inquiries, have fully satisfied this Meeting of the existence of great abuses in several departments of the Executive Government of the country.

That G. L. Wardle, esq. by his unexampled intrepidity, integrity, and ability in originating and persevering in that inquiry, unsupported by party interests, and opposed by power, has faithfully discharged his duty as an honest Member of Parliament, rendered an important service to his country, and merited the warmest thanks and approbation of this Meeting.

That the hon. Thomas Brand and sir John Saunders Sebright, bart. the Representatives in Parliament for this county, by the disposition they have manifested to inquire into and check abuses and corruption, by the support they uniformly gave to the appointment of an efficient Finance Committee, and particularly by the active support they gave to Mr. Wardle's motion, and to the rendering effective the Inquiry, have, in a high degree, merited the approbation and confidence of their constituents, and that it is the earnest hope of this Meeting that they will persevere in inquiring into every abuse till the public confidence in the administration of national affairs is fully restored.

That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to sir F. Burdett, bart. who seconded Mr. Wardle's motion; to lord Folkestone, and S. Whitbread, esq. who unremittingly promoted the Inquiry, and to lord John Townshend, Joseph Halsey, esq. and Sa-

muel Smith, esq. Members residing in this county, and to sir S. Romilly, gen. Ferguson, adm. Markham, J. C. Curwen, esq. lord vise. Althorpe, C. W. Wynne, T. W. Coke, esq. and the rest of the 125 Members who divided in favour of Mr. Wardle's motion for an Address to his Majesty.

That the Thanks of this Meeting be also given to Nicholson Calvert, esq. Daniel Giles, esq. and to the honourable William Lamb, Members, residing in this county, and to all those other Members of the House of Commons who composed the numerous respectable, and eventually successful, Minorities.

Resolved unanimously, That the increasing influence of the Crown is an evil progressively undermining the constitutional rights of the people, and that the late prodigious and rapid increase of our national debt, with that of our military and colonial establishment, have created an influence, the force of which, acting upon a great body of Electors, has driven the liberties of this country from the firm basis of popular representation, to a dependance upon the moderation and forbearance of the Crown.

Resolved unanimously, That, although it is the duty of the great Officers of the Crown to bring to light delinquency and abuses in office, yet we have seen with extreme regret the Members of Administration exerting their influence to screen delinquency, and prevent the discovery of mal-practices in several recent instances, and while we earnestly deprecate all unconstitutional attempts at reformation out of the House of Commons, we think it necessary to express our earnest hope that the independent and patriotic Members of that honourable House will exert themselves in obtaining that Reform, as also in discovering and prosecuting all corrupt abuses in every department of the State, and in applying such constitutional checks as may secure the people against a recurrence of the same.

Resolved unanimously, That this Meeting has perceived with regret that the Majorities of the House of Commons upon this and some other recent occasions, have differed essentially from the sense of the people, thereby affording them a convincing proof that a Reform in the Representation of the People is indispensably necessary to the expression of the public sentiments.

Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to William Plumer, esq. our late worthy and independent

representative, who signed the Requisition and brought forward the Resolutions, as the steady friend of Reform and enemy of Corruption, and for his patriotic and disinterested conduct on all occasions in support of the independence of this County, and the general rights and liberties of the people.

#### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Decree of the Supreme Junta, dated Feb. 7, 1809, (concluded from p. 576.)*

—that acts of the most atrocious kind, and which make human nature shudder, are daily heard of, such as the death of a nun, who threw herself into a well, to avoid the brutality of a Frenchman; the cruel murder of a mother, whose breasts were cut off in the act of giving suck to her son, by those monsters, who afterwards sabred her infant; and a number of other cases equally horrible; atrocities painful to write, dreadful to read, and degrading to endure; —finally, his Majesty being convinced, that still to observe the laws of natural equity with those who respect no law whatever, would not be moderation and justice, but the most culpable indifference and the basest meanness, has resolved to repress and punish those crimes. Calling therefore all Europe to witness the awful necessity which has compelled him to resort to the means of retaliation, by returning on a sanguinary banditti violence for violence, he hereby decrees:

1. That no quarter shall be given to any French soldier, Officer or General, who may be made prisoner in any town or district, in which acts contrary to the laws of war have been committed by the enemy, but that such persons shall be immediately put to the sword, as an example to their companions and a satisfaction to outraged humanity.

2. That the present Decree shall be printed, proclaimed, and distributed in the Spanish armies, in order to its due execution. You are also required to make arrangements for the fulfilment of the same.—The Marquis of ASTORGA, Vice President.—MARTIN DE GARAY. Done in the Royal Al-cazan of Seville, Feb. 7, 1809.

TURKEY.—*Treaty between Great Britain and the Sublime Porte.*

1. From the moment of the signature of the present Treaty all acts of hostility

shall cease, between England and Turkey, and the prisoners on both sides, in consequence of this happy peace, shall be at liberty in thirty-one days after the signature of this Treaty, or sooner if possible.

2. If there should be any places belonging to the Sublime Porte, in possession of Great Britain, they are to be restored, and given up to the Sublime Porte, with all their cannon, ammunition, and other effects, in the same condition in which they were found when occupied by the English; and this restitution must take place within thirty-one days after the signature of the present Treaty.

3. If there shall be effects or property appertaining to English merchants, or sequestered under the jurisdiction of the Sublime Porte, that shall be all returned and restored to the proprietors—and in like manner, if there shall be effects, property, or vessels, appertaining to the merchants and subjects of the Sublime Porte, under sequestration at Malta, or in the other Isles and States of his Britannic Majesty, they shall in like manner be entirely returned and restored to the proprietors.

4. The articles of the Treaty stipulated in the Turkish year 1086, in the moon Djemaz ul Akber, as also the article relative to the commerce of the Black Sea, and the other privileges (midjiazals) equally established by the acts of subsequent periods, shall be observed and maintained as heretofore, and as if they had not suffered any interruption.

5. In consequence of the good treatment and favour granted by the Sublime Porte to the English merchants with respect to their merchandize and property, and every thing of which they may stand in need—and, in like manner, with regard to all objects tending to facilitate the commerce, England shall reciprocally grant entire favour and an amicable treatment to the flags, subjects, and merchants of the Sublime Porte—who shall hereafter frequent the States of his Britannic Majesty.

6. The tariff of the cu-toms, which was latterly fixed at Constantinople, at the old rate of three per cent, and especially the article which respects internal commerce, shall be constantly observed as they have been regulated. To this England promises to conform.

7. The Ambassador of his Majesty the

King of Great Britain shall fully enjoy the honours enjoyed by other nations at the Sublime Porte; and reciprocally the Ambassadors of the Sublime Porte to the Court of London shall fully enjoy all the honours which shall be granted to the Ambassadors of Great Britain.

8. It shall be permitted to name Schabiders (Consuls) at Malta, and in the States of his Britannic Majesty, wherever it may be necessary to inspect the affairs and interests of the Turkish merchants, and the same treatment and privileges which are allowed to English Consuls residing in the Ottoman States, shall be rigidly observed towards the Schabiders of the Sublime Porte.

9. The English Consuls and Ambassadors shall, according to custom, employ such drogmans as they may have occasion for; but as it has been before decreed by common consent, the Sublime Porte will not grant the berat of drogman in favour of individuals who do not exercise that function in the place of their destination. It is agreed, conformably to this principle, that henceforward the berat shall not be granted to any person of the rank of tradesman or barker, nor to any one who shall keep a shop or manufactory in the public market, or who shall be concerned in affairs of this kind; and he shall not be appointed by the English Consuls from among the subjects of the Sublime Porte.

10. The English patent of protection shall not be granted to any person from among the dependents or merchants, subjects of the Sublime Porte, nor shall there be delivered to them any passport from the Ambassadors or Consuls, without the permission of the Sublime Porte.

11. As it has been at all times forbidden for ships of war to enter the canals of Constantinople, viz. in the Strait of the Dardanelles, or that of the Black Sea, and as that ancient rule of the Ottoman Empire must be henceforward observed in time of peace by all Powers whatever, the British Court promise to conform to this principle.

12. The Ratification of this present Treaty of Peace, between the High Contracting Powers, shall be exchanged at Constantinople in the space of ninety-one days from the date of the present Treaty, or sooner if possible.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 21.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 27, 1809.

[Price 1s.

"A MODERATE and temperate Reform in the Abuses of the Constitution is due to the people, who being on their part just to the monarchical and aristocratical branches of the Constitution, who commit no invasion of the rights, and seek no abridgements of the powers of either, are entitled to have their own share in the legislation of their country, freed from the unjust usurpations of others, and to possess uninvaded, and to exercise uncontroled by the other branches of the government, those rights which this happy Constitution, in the matchless excellence of its principles, has solely and exclusively allotted to the people. A Reform of such a character may lessen the means, and diminish the opportunities of corrupting legislation, both in its source and in its progress; it may reduce the influence by which unconstitutional ministers preserve their power, but it will save the nation from their profusion, and perpetuate that Constitution which all equally profess to venerate: Such a Reform I believe cannot, with perfect safety, be long delayed; the more readily and cheerfully those rights which belong only to the people are restored by those who at present, in too many instances, possess and exercise them, the more firm and established will be the present happy form of our government, the more safe from risque and danger will be the just prerogatives of the crown, and the peculiar acknowledged hereditary privileges of this House."—*LORD LAUDERDALE's Protest, in the House of Lords, 31 May 1792.*

[S01] ————— [S02]

TO THE  
INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

LETTER III.

## PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

*Whether the present state of the Representation be consonant with the principles of that Constitution, which has so long been the boast of Englishmen?*

GENTLEMEN;

I. BEFORE I proceed to the discussion of this question, suffer me, for one moment, to advert to an assertion, which has been made by more than one member of the House of Commons; namely, that the country does not wish for a Reform of Parliament. Precisely what these gentlemen may mean, when they say "the country," neither you nor I can positively tell; but, I think, it would be extremely difficult for any man to devise a method, by which to draw from a country, containing so many people as this, any thing better intitled to the appellation of the general wish, than that expression of a wish for Reform, which has now been uttered in this Kingdom. It is notorious, that there is scarcely any portion of the people, who may be deemed at liberty to express their opinions, who have not decidedly declared for Reform. Even in Cornwall, where, if any where, the cause of Reform might reasonably be expected to meet with few friends, a County Meeting, held at Bodmin on the 13th instant, resolved, "That the corruptions which have been suffered to accumulate to so grievous an extent in this country, are to be traced to the defective state of the representation; that it is, therefore, the

firm conviction of this Meeting, that a Reform in the representation of the people in the Commons House of Parliament, is the only effectual corrective of existing abuses; and that the only security against future corruptions, will be the restoring to the people that share of the elective franchise which the public good requires, and to which they are entitled by the principles of the British Constitution."—It is but just to the County of Cornwall, as well as to the cause of Reform, to state, which I do upon certain information, that Lord Eliot, Lord de Dunstanville, Mr. F. Gregor, Mr. F. G. Glanville, Mr. William Rashleigh, Mr. Charles Rashleigh, and several other of those, who are well known to have a deep interest in the numerous boroughs in that County, were present at the Meeting, and that, notwithstanding their opposition, the Resolutions were carried by a majority of fifty to one. It is also worthy of notice, that the Resolutions were brought forward by Mr. Colman Rashleigh, a near relation of two of the above named gentlemen, who are well known to have the largest share in the management of the Cornish boroughs. It is further proper to state, that Lord de Dunstanville and Mr. Gregor, who took an active part in the debate, said, that they had no objection to a vote of thanks to Mr. Wardle; though it will be recollect, that the king's ministers, in the House of Commons, declared their resolution to oppose a vote of thanks to that gentleman, if it were brought forward. A similar declaration was, you will recollect, made by all our opponents at Winchester, which it is

very material to bear in mind, because it shows, that even the supporters of the ministers have not, when they come to meet the people face to face, the courage to maintain the declarations of those ministers.—The result of this Meeting in Cornwall is a good specimen, but it is no more than a specimen, of what has passed, and is passing, in every part of the kingdom, where the people have the liberty to assemble for the purposes of political discussion; and yet, there are men, who scruple not to assert, and that, too, without the smallest reservation, that “the ‘country’ does *not* wish for a Parliamentary Reform!

II. Now, Gentlemen, in coming to the question before us, when we talk of the *Constitution*, we surely mean, that there is *something*; something *really in existence*, to which that favourite word applies? We surely have not talked and written and preached and even prayed so long about a thing, which has no existence in the world, and which is merely a creature of the imagination? Well, then, what is this *Constitution*? Fully to define it, in a short compass, would be impossible; because the definition is to be drawn from numerous usages and laws. But, a definition, quite sufficient for our present purpose, is this: that the Constitution provides, that no man shall suffer punishment, in any way, unless he be guilty of an offence known to the laws; that no man shall be held in confinement, unless upon sufficient cause being legally shown; that the dwelling, or possessions, of no man shall be entered into against his consent, unless for sufficient cause legally shown; that the property of no man shall be taken from him, unless for just cause legally shown; that the property of no man shall be taken from him, in the way of taxes, without his consent; and that, in order that these rights and liberties may be preserved, the people shall be represented in a Commons House of Parliament, the members of which shall be elected by the people themselves.

Such is the substance of the Constitution of England; that constitution, for which we are called upon to fight and to make pecuniary sacrifices enormous, and for which we are ready to fight and make any sacrifices that can be named.—It is easy to perceive, however, that, as far as regards the safety either of the persons or the property of the people, all must finally depend upon the state of the Representation in Parliament; upon the point, whether

they be, or be not, in reality, represented in the Commons’ House; or, in other words, whether the members of that house be, or be not, chosen by the people.

From *Magna Charta* down to the *Act of Settlement*, there runs through the whole of our laws, this leading principle; namely, that nothing shall be taken from the people, in taxes, *without their own consent*; and, indeed, *Magna Charta* itself was nothing more than a declaration and confirmation of what was the law of the land before. That every individual is to give his consent to a tax, when the tax is demanded of him, neither is nor ever was the notion; but, that no tax is to be levied upon any man, without the consent of the people, *given by their representatives*, in a general assembly, always was the notion, and the settled doctrine of the kingdom of England. Indeed, it is this, and this alone, which distinguishes the government of England from that of any state subject to the will of a despot; for, take away this, and we are subject immediately to lose any part of our property that those who have the sword of authority in their hands choose to take from us. Without this, the people have no check upon the Crown, or upon the Aristocracy; and, it will be easily seen, that, without this check, the sparing of even our persons must, with any ministry, be merely a question of policy.

With respect to the mode of appointing persons to represent the people, divers regulations have been made, in order to insure the operation of probity and of good sense in this important business. With regard to the qualifications of the representatives, the description, at a more remote period, was less definite; latterly a landed qualification has been settled; but, always, it was a principle, that members of parliament should be men of substantial property, which was, of itself, a sufficient check against any thing of too democratical a cast. On the part of the people, *property* was, as, in reason, it must be, the basis of the right, or duty, to choose members of parliament; and, there could be, in remote times, no distinction as to the different sorts of property, because those who were *not freeholders* had, in fact, *no property at all*, and were merely the vassals of the Barons and other great men. But, while time has completely worn away this character of vassal, and while copyholders and other owners of real property, have, as to all other purposes, become of full as much consequence as the owners of free-

hold land, the right, or duty, of voting, has, with regard to the counties, been perseveringly confined to the freeholders: the name of freeholder has been kept up to the utter destruction of the constitutional principle of suffrage. And, as to the boroughs, which were called upon to send representatives, they were so called upon, because they were, at the time, places of the *greatest trade* in the kingdom, when it is notorious, that, at this time, many of them have dwindled into mere villages or hamlets, some of them containing scarcely a single house. In those times *Old Sarum* was a considerable place, and *Manchester* a place of no consideration at all; and, in order to have a striking view of the unreasonableness of still leaving to the former the choice of two members, while the latter chooses no member at all, we have only to suppose the case of calling upon *Old Sarum* to pay more in taxes than *Manchester*, because it *formerly* paid more in taxes. If such a demand were made, who would not exclaim against its injustice? Should we not hear it said, that the scythe of time had disabled *Old Sarum* from paying its ancient proportion of taxes? Well, then, shall the effect of the attacks of time furnish no argument in favour of a change in the representation, when it is found to be unanswerable in favour of a change in behalf of the places represented? To leave the choosing of members of parliament to old and decayed boroughs is as contrary to reason as it would be to expect from age and decrepitude the functions of youth. Whenever any invasion of the rights of the people has taken place, and has called forth an appeal to our ancient laws, we have been answered by the remark, that one of the great excellencies of the constitution is, that it is *constantly capable of amendment*; and is it not very strange, then, that those who have thus answered us, should, as to this point, wherein the hand of time has been so manifestly destructive, refuse, and represent as an attempt at *innovation*, any proposition to alter or amend? The truth is, that to leave the choosing of members to rotten boroughs and to forty shilling freeholders *is the innovation*; this is the innovator, and time is the innovator. The constitution makes real *property* the basis of representation in the counties, and *trade* in the towns and cities; therefore, where time has removed this basis, there is an innovation introduced; and to apprehend the destruction of the ancient fabric of the constitution

from giving Manchester representatives instead of *Gatton* or *Old Sarum*, is just as wise as it would be to apprehend the fall of a building from the removing of a rotten pillar and putting a sound one in its stead.

III. Let us now see what has been written upon this subject by that author, to whom our adversaries, in all other cases, think proper to appeal. I mean the famous Commentator on the Law of England, Mr. BLACKSTONE, who, in 1768, when his work was first published, was a *Professor of Law* in the University of Oxford, and who, in consequence of his writing that work, was afterwards made a *Judge*. Let us who are accused of *clamour* and *factiousness*, and of *wild* notions and *chimerical* projects; let us, to get rid at once of all this, appeal to the book of Blackstone; and then let those, who defend the corruptions of parliament, and who abuse all those, who dislike those corruptions, direct their abuse towards this great legal authority. “The *Commons*,” says Blackstone, “consist of *all such men of any property*, in the kingdom, as have *not seats in the house of lords*; every *one of whom has a voice in parliament*, *either personally, or by his representatives*. “In a free state, every man, who is supposed a free agent, ought to be, in some measure, his own governor; and therefore a branch, at least, of the legislative power should reside in the whole body of the people. And this power, when the territories of the state are small and its citizens easily known, should be exercised by the people in their aggregate or collective capacity, as was wisely ordained in the petty republics of Greece, and the first rudiments of the Roman state.” . . . . . “In so large a state as ours it is very wisely contrived, that the people should do that by their representatives, which it is impracticable to perform in person: representatives, chosen by a number of minute and separate districts, wherein all the voters are, or easily may be, distinguished. The counties are, therefore, represented by knights, elected by the proprietors of lands; the cities and boroughs are represented by citizens and burgesses, chosen by the mercantile part or supposed trading interest of the nation.” . . . . After a description of the great powers of parliament; the unlimited and unchecked powers of that body, he proceeds thus:—“So that it is a matter most essential to the liberties of this kingdom, that such members be delegated to this important

" trust, as are most eminent for their probity, their fortitude, and their knowledge; for it was a known apothegm of the great lord treasurer Burleigh, " that England could never be ruined but by a parliament :" and, as sir Matthew Hale observes, this being the highest and greatest court, over which none other can have jurisdiction in the kingdom, if by any means a mis-government should any way fall upon it, the subjects of this king may be left without all manner of remedy. To the same purpose the PRESIDENT MONTESQUIEU, though I trust too hastily, presages; " that as Rome, Sparta, and Carthage have lost their liberty and perished, so the constitution of England will in time lose its liberty, will perish; it will perish, whenever the legislative power shall become more corrupt than the executive." . . . . .

" With regard to taxes: it is the ancient, indisputable privilege and right of the house of commons, that all grants of subsidies or parliamentary aids do begin in their house, and are first bestowed by them; although their grants are not effectual to all intents and purposes, until they have the assent of the other two branches of the legislature. The general reason, given for this exclusive privilege of the house of commons, is, that the supplies are raised upon the body of the people, and, therefore, it is proper that they alone should have a right of taxing themselves. This reason would be unanswerable, if the commons taxed none but themselves: but it is notorious, that a very large share of property is in the possession of the house of lords; that this property is equally taxable, and taxed, as the property of the commons; and, therefore, the commons not being the sole persons taxed, this cannot be the reason of their having the sole right of raising and modelling the supply. The true reason, arising from the spirit of our constitution, seems to be this: The lords being a permanent and hereditary body, created at pleasure by the king, are supposed more liable to be influenced by the crown, and when once influenced to continue so, than the commons, who are a temporary elective body, freely nominated by the people. It would therefore be extremely dangerous, to give them any power of framing new taxes for the subject." —That is to say, it would be extremely dangerous to give a power of taxing the people to any persons, liable to be under the influence of the

Crown.—He next comes to the qualifications demanded of the electors; and, from his account of this part of the constitution, it will be easily seen, what is now wanted in order to restore the spirit of that constitution.—" The true reason of requiring any qualification, with regard to property, in voters, is to exclude such persons as are in so mean a situation that they are esteemed to have no will of their own. If these persons had votes, they would be tempted to dispose of them under some undue influence or other. This would give a great, an artful, or a wealthy man, a larger share in elections than is consistent with general liberty. If it were probable that every man would give his vote freely, and without influence of any kind, then, upon the true theory and genuine principles of liberty, every member of the community, however poor, should have a vote in electing those delegates, to whose charge is committed the disposal of his property, his liberty, and his life. But, since that can hardly be expected in persons of indigent fortunes, or such as are under the immediate dominion of others, all popular states have been obliged to establish certain qualifications; whereby some, who are suspected to have no will of their own, are excluded from voting, in order to set other individuals, whose wills may be supposed independent, more thoroughly upon a level with each other." . . . . .

" The knights of the shires are to be chosen of people dwelling in the same counties; whereof every man shall have a freehold to the value of forty shillings by the year within the county; which, by subsequent statutes, is to be clear of all charges and deductions, except parliamentary and parochial taxes. The knights of shires are the representatives of the landholders, or landed interest, of the kingdom, their electors must therefore have estates in lands or tenements, within the county represented: these estates must be freehold, that is, for term of life at least; because beneficial leases for long terms of years were not in use at the making of these statutes, and copyholders were then little better than villeins, absolutely dependent upon their lord: this freehold must be of forty shillings annual value; because that sum would, then, with proper industry, furnish all the necessaries of life, and render the freeholder, if he pleased, an independent man." . . . . .

" As for the electors of citizens and burghesses, these are supposed to be the mercantile part or trading interest of this kingdom. But as trade is of a fluctuating nature, and seldom long fixed in a place, it was formerly left to the crown to summon *pro se nata* the most flourishing towns to send representatives to parliament. So that, as towns increased in trade, and grew populous, they were admitted to a share in the legislature. But the misfortune is, that the deserted boroughs continued to be summoned, as well as those to whom their trade and inhabitants were transferred."

. . . . He next comes to the qualifications and disqualifications of representatives.—" That in strictness, all members ought to be inhabitants of the places for which they are chosen: but this is entirely disregarded. That no persons concerned in the management of any duties or taxes created since 1692, except the commissioners of the treasury, nor any of the officers following, (namely, commissioners of prizes, transports, sick and wounded, wine licences, navy and victualling; secretaries or receivers of prizes; comptrollers of the army accounts; agents for regiments; governors of plantations and their deputies; officers of Minorca or Gibraltar; officers of the excise and customs; clerks or deputies in the several offices of the treasury, exchequer, naval, victualling, admiralty, pay of the army or navy, secretaries of state, salt, stamps, appeals, wine licences, hackney coaches, hawkers, and pedlars) nor any persons that hold any new office under the crown created since 1705, are capable of being elected members. That no person having a pension under the crown during pleasure, or for any term of years, is capable of being elected. That if any member accepts an office under the crown, except an officer in the army or navy accepting a new commission, his seat is void; but such member is capable of being re-elected;" which latter, it must be observed, is in consequence of an act, made to repeal a part of the act, which placed the king's family upon the throne of England.— I conclude with what he says about the value of really free elections.—" It is essential to the very being of parliament, that elections should be absolutely free; therefore, all undue influences upon the electors are illegal, and strongly prohibited. For Mr. Locke ranks it among those breaches of trust in the executive

" magistrate, which according to his notions, amount to a dissolution of the government, " if he employs the force, treasure and officers of the society to corrupt the representatives, or openly to pre-engage the electors, and prescribe what manner of persons shall be chosen. For thus to regulate candidates and electors, and new model the ways of election, what is it," says he, " but to cut up the government by the roots, and poison the very fountain of public security?"

Such, Gentlemen, is BLACKSTONE's description of the Constitution of England, as far as relates to the composition of the House of Commons, and to the share which the People ought to have in the composing of that House. Let us, then, see how the fact squares with this description; let us ask ourselves, whether that which Blackstone says *ought* to be the state of things, in this respect, really is the state of things at this present time; or, in other words, whether we now have that constitution, which the friends of corruption accuse us of a desire to destroy.—Have all men of property (except the peers) a voice in parliament, either personally or by their representatives?—Is there a branch of the legislative power, which resides wholly in the people?—Are the county members elected by the proprietors of the land?—Are the borough members elected by the mercantile or trading interests of the nation?—Are the members of the House of Commons persons most eminent for their probity, their fortitude, or their knowledge?—Has there never, by any means, a misgovernment fallen upon that House?—Do the people really, by their representatives, tax themselves?—Is the qualification for voters such as to exclude persons in so mean a situation, that they are esteemed to have no will of their own, and are liable to be tempted to dispose of their votes under some undue influence or other?—Is the income of forty shillings a year now sufficient to render the freeholder an independent man?—Are placemen and pensioners excluded from seats in the House of Commons; or, do the people really acquire the right of choosing them anew after they have accepted of places?—Are elections absolutely free, which Blackstone avers to be essential to the very being of parliament?—And finally, is the force or treasure, or are the offices, of the society, never employed to corrupt the representatives, or openly to pre-engage

the electors, and prescribe what manner of persons shall be chosen?

IV. Leaving it to you, Gentlemen, to answer these questions, I shall now proceed to state certain undeniable facts, ap pertaining to this subject; and then I shall leave you to draw your own conclusions, and to decide the question, whether a Reform of the House of Commons, be, or be not necessary.—The first of these facts is, That, in the year 1793, a Petition was presented to the House of Commons, by CHARLES GREY, Esq. (now Earl Grey), in which Petition it was, amongst other things, stated, that *one hundred and fifty-four individuals*, did, by their patronage (or unlawful influence) send *three hundred and seven* Members to the House of Commons, forming, of course, a decided majority of the 558 Members of which the House then consisted; and that the petitioners were ready to prove this at the bar of the House.—SECOND: That, in the said Petition, the petitioners declared, that they had the most reasonable grounds to suspect, that no less than *one hundred and fifty* of the Members of the Commons' House, owed their elections entirely to the *interference of Peers*.—THIRD: That the Statute Law declares, that *Peers shall not interfere* in the election of any Member of the Commons' House.—FOURTH: That, for many years past, Seats in the House of Commons have been publicly advertised for sale.—FIFTH: That, on the 10th of December, 1779, the House of Commons passed a Resolution in these words: “That it is *highly criminal* for “any Minister or Ministers, or any other “Servant of the Crown in Great Britain, “directly or indirectly, to make use of the “power of his office, in order to influence “the election of Members of Parliament, and “that an attempt to exercise that influence “was an attack upon the *dignity*, the *honour* and the *independence* of Parliament, “an infringement of the *rights* and the *liberties* of the people, and an attempt to “sap the basis of our free and happy *Constitution*.”—SIXTH: That, on the 25th of April last, the following Resolutions were, by Lord ARCHIBALD HAMILTON, moved in the House of Commons: “1. “That it appears to the House, from the “evidence on the table, that Lord Vice. “Castlereagh, in the year 1805, shortly “after he had quitted the situation of Pre- “sident of the Board of Control, and “being a Privy Counsellor and Secretary “of State, did place at the disposal of Lord “Clancarty, a Member of the same Board,

“the nomination to a Writership, in order “to facilitate his procuring a *Seat in Parlia- “ment*.—2. That it was owing to a dis- “agreement among the subordinate parties, “that this transaction did not take effect; “and—3. That by this conduct Lord “Castlereagh had been guilty of a gross “violation of his duty as a Servant of the “Crown; an abuse of his patronage as “President of the Board of Control: and “an attack upon the purity of that House,” which Resolutions were *rejected* by the House.—SEVENTH: That, upon the same day, and upon the same occasion, the House passed a Resolution in substance as follows:—“That while it was *the bounden duty of that House to maintain at all times a jealous guard upon its purity*, “and not to suffer any attempt upon its “privileges to pass unnoticed, the at- “tempt in the present instance (that “of Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Reding), “not having been carried into effect, that “House did not think it then necessary “to proceed to any *criminatory Resolu- tions respecting the same*.”—EIGHTH: That, on the 11th of the present month of May, Mr. MADOCKS made, in the House of Commons, a charge in substance as follows: “I affirm, then, that Mr. Dick pur- “chased a *Seat in the House of Commons* “for the borough of Cashel, through the “agency of the HONOURABLE HENRY “WELLESLEY, who acted for, and on behalf “of, the Treasury: that, upon a recent “question of the last importance, when “Mr. Dick had determined to vote ac- “cording to his conscience, the noble “Lord, CASTLEREAGH, did intimate to that “gentleman the necessity of either his “voting with the government, or resigning his “seat in that House: and that Mr. Dick, “sooner than vote against principle, did “make choice of the latter alternative; “and vacate his seat accordingly. To “this transaction I charge the Right Ho- “nourable Gentleman, MR. PERCEVAL, as “being privy and having connived at it. This “I will engage to prove by witnesses at “your Bar, if the House will give me “leave to call them.”—NINTH: That, at the end of a long Debate upon this subject, the question was taken upon a motion FOR AN INQUIRY into the matter; that there appears from the Report of the Proceedings, published in the papers, to have been 395 Members present; that, out of the 395, only 85 voted for the motion, which, of course, was lost, there being 310, out of the 395, who VOTED AGAINST THE MOTION FOR IN-

QUIRY.—TENTH: That, in the year 1802, this same Mr. PERCEVAL, being then Attorney General, prosecuted PHILIP HAMLIN, a Tinman of Plymouth, for having committed the crime of offering Mr. Addington £2,000, to give him a place in the Custom House; that, upon this occasion, Mr. Perceval demanded judgment upon the said Hamlin, for the sake of *public justice*; and that the Judge, after expatiating upon the “incalculable mischief,” to which such crimes must naturally lead, sentenced the said Hamlin to pay a fine of a hundred pounds to the king, and to be imprisoned for three calendar months.—ELEVENTH: That in the year 1805, Evidence was taken before a Committee of the House of Commons, and was laid before that House, proving that the late minister, PITT, had lent, without the consent or knowledge of Parliament, and without the consent or knowledge of any council of the king, £40,000 of the public money (without any interest paid to the public) to two members of the then *House of Commons*; and that, when this matter was brought before the House, in 1805, no censure whatever was passed on the said minister, but he was, by a *bill of indemnity*, secured from any punishment for having in such way employed the money of the public.—TWELFTH: That, it appears from a Report, laid before the House of Commons, in the month of June last, in consequence of a motion made by Lord Cochrane, that there then were, in that House, seventy-eight Placemen and Pensioners, who, though part of what they receive is not stated, are, in the said Report, stated to receive 178,994 pounds a year out of the public money.

Now, Gentlemen, to these facts, and to many, many others (others too numerous to state, even in the most brief manner), which might be added to them, I shall not subjoin a single word by way of comment. I wish to avoid every thing like high colouring; every thing like declamation; every thing calculated to rouse any angry passion in your breasts: I wish to avoid even persuasion; I wish to lay the state of the case fairly and clearly before you, and to leave the decision to the intelligence and the rectitude of your own minds. Those of you, who, notwithstanding what has been here stated, may be of opinion, that the present state of the representation in parliament is consonant with the principles of the Constitution of England, will of course, see no justifiable cause for any reform in that representa-

tion; but, those of you, who may think with me, that the present state of the representation is *not* consonant with those admirable principles, will, I trust, be disposed to follow me in my next Letter, into an inquiry respecting *what sort of Reform* it would be just and prudent to adopt.

I am,

Your friend,

W<sup>m</sup>. COBBETT.

Botley, 24 May, 1809.

#### “ELEMENTS OF REFORM.”

THERE has been published, in London, a pamphlet under this title, and under the name of “MR. WILLIAM COBBETT,” as the author. It consists of passages from my writings, *against Reform* and *against Reformers*; and, the object of it is, to counteract, by the publication of these passages, the effect of what I am now writing in *favour of Reform*.—That the compilers of such a work should include those passages from the different parts of my works, wherein I have candidly confessed the *error*, under which I wrote what they have selected for publication; that such persons should do this is not to be expected; nor is it to be expected from them to make even fair extracts as far as they go. They have, as might be reasonably expected, garbled every thing that they have touched.—But, while I am very certain, that their publication will wholly fail of its object; while I am certain, that no one will think me bound to praise John Bowles *now*, because I praised him in 1800, when I must almost necessarily be, and when I really was, totally ignorant of what I have since learnt respecting the subject of his writings, as well as respecting his too evident motives; while I am certain, that no one, who has a grain of sense, will think me bound *now* to censure Sir Francis Burdett, because I did severely censure him at a time when I acted under a total misrepresentation of his principles and his character; while I am certain, that no man of common sense, or common honesty, will think me bound to deprecate a Reform of Parliament *now*, because I did deprecate it at a time when I had never known that seats were advertised for sale, and when I had never seen, or dreamt of the possibility of, any thing like what has now come to light and has been proved respecting the *House of Commons*; while I am certain that the nation, who, with far better opportunities of knowing the truth, were full as much deceived as I was, and whose

change of opinion has kept pace with mine, will not think me now bound to applaud a system of politics, war, and finance, of which it was terrified into an approbation ten years ago, and all the mischiefs of which we have since seen exposed ; while I am certain, that none but very weak persons indeed will think any man bound to praise any thing after he has discovered it to be unworthy of the praise that he once bestowed on it ; while I am certain of all this, I cannot refrain from observing how favourable a symptom this publication is to the cause of Reform ; how strong an indication it is of the fear, which the friends of corruption entertain, of the effects of that discussion, upon which they perceive me to have seriously entered. In America, my opponents, who were very numerous, and who had far greater talents than the persons, with whom I have now to contend, were driven to a somewhat similar expedient. The public, after having been surfeited with their pamphlets against me, would read no more ; when, what did these opponents do ? Why, what has now been done here : they published pamphlets under my name, and then, for a time at least, they found them sell. There were several booksellers at a time living upon my name ; actually buying bread and cheese with it. I used to urge the injustice of their not giving me a share ; and, really, I think, that the gentlemen here are liable to the same charge ; for, not one of them has offered me the smallest acknowledgment. If the public will not read books unless they have my name to them, I think it is but just, that I should have some small part in the gains. I shall be content with less than a Dutch-Commissioner's profit ; but something I certainly ought to have.—That those, with whom this pamphlet originates, wish, by the publication, to injure the cause of Reform there can be little doubt ; and, I think, that there can be as little, that they are, in this effort, countering their own wish. For, in the first place, their flying to my former opinions as affording a contrast to those which I now entertain, upon this subject, is a pretty good proof that they have neither fact nor argument, whereon to meet me upon the merits of the case. In the next place, the errors, which they expose, and which have, long ago, been distinctly confessed by me, only serve to show, in the strongest possible light, how completely I was deceived, and, thereby, to form an apology for

the change of opinion in others. All we want is, as Major Cartwright has said, *discussion* ; discussion is what these gentlemen are assisting with all their might ; and, if they have but a moderate share of discernment, I should think that the *great sale*, which their pamphlet is said to have, must leave upon their minds the mortifying conviction of the *popularity* of the “Elements of Reform, by Mr. Wm. Cobbett ;” for, from this title, it is not a work *against*, but in *favour* of Reform, that the public think they are buying. They think it is a *new* work ; a work containing what I have written at *the present time* ; and by adopting such a title and taking my name, the publishers themselves confess, that that matter and that name stand high in the public estimation. The publishers are very cautious, in their advertisements, to let fall nothing *hostile* to me ; because they know, that by so doing they would injure their sale ; and, it is truly curious to see the COURIER and even the MORNING POST trumpeting forth the praises of a Work on Reform, “by Mr. Wm. Cobbett,” the effect of which must be this : that all those, who do not read the pamphlet, will look upon those papers as having become converts to my doctrine ; while on the other hand, the pamphlet will have no effect at all upon those who do read it, because they have already read my confession of the errors, which it contains.

—The doctrine of *consistency*, as now in vogue, is the most absurd that ever was broached. It teaches, that, if you once think well of any person or thing, you must always think well of that person or thing, whatever changes may take place either in them, or in the state of your information respecting them. For instance, if you praise a man to-day, and, to-morrow, receive proof of his having long been a thief, you must still continue to praise him. Where is the man, who has not changed his opinions of men as well as of things ? Those who write every day, or every week, must express what they think at the time ; but, if new sources of information open to them, they must express what they *then* think, and not with any regard to what they have given as their opinion before.—But, how would this doctrine suit my opponents, if I were to attempt to hold them to. If I am to say, to some of the friends of corruption, “you used to praise me, and why do you ‘not praise me now?’” They would, doubtless, answer : “Oh ! but, you ‘then wrote to please us ; and now you

“ do not : Owing to your ignorance of us “ and our views, we *then* were objects of “ your applause, and *now* we are objects “ of your censure.” To be sure, nothing could be more reasonable than this. There is nothing at all *inconsistent* in it ; but, then, the argument is just as good for me as it is for them.—The truth is, that, as to opinions, no man is to be blamed for a change, except there be strong reason to conclude that the change has proceeded from a *bad motive* ; or, rather, that it is not a real, but a pretended change, for the purpose of something selfish or wicked. This is the case, when we see men change their opinions upon exchanging no offices, for offices under the crown ; when they have one set of principles for *out of place*, and another set of principles for *in place*. Now, nothing of this sort can possibly be imputed to me ; and, in short, it is quite impossible to make any man of sense believe, that the change in my opinions has proceeded from any other cause than that of a sincere conviction, that, in my former opinions, I was wrong.—I am not very anxious to make an apology for the errors of my former opinions ; but, surely, without attributing to myself any very extraordinary want of discernment, those errors, when my then peculiar situation be considered, stand in need of nothing by way of excuse. When John Bowles said : “ My attachment to the British Monarchy, “ and to the reigning family, is rooted in “ my heart’s core ; my anxiety for the “ British throne, pending the dangers to “ which, in common with every other “ throne, it has lately been exposed, has “ embittered my choicest comforts ; and I “ most solemnly vow, before Almighty “ God, to devote myself, to the end of my “ days, to the maintenance of that throne.” When John Bowles said this, I praised John Bowles ; but, must I praise him *now*? —I have been told, that the King, when he visited Cussnells in 1804, (and which, in my opinion, he ought not to have been advised to visit) said, the moment he entered the house, “ where “ is MY FRIEND Cobbett’s Paper ? ” This was told to me, not long ago, by one, who, I thought, appeared to think it necessary to remind me of my duty to the king. But, in what instance have I ever shown a want of a due sense of that duty ? When have I ever hinted, that the royal office and authority were not essential to the happiness and even to the *liberty* of the people ? When have I expressed a wish hostile to the king’s person, autho-

rity, prerogatives, or family ? When have I, as these pamphlet compilers would insinuate, expressed any opinion which could justify the inference, that I wished for the predominance of a mob, or the degradation of royalty or aristocracy ? The truth is, that I have been constantly labouring to prevent the degradation of both ; and, if either has been degraded, it is because my labours have, with respect to them, been unavailing. If I ever did merit the honour of being, by the king himself, called *his friend*, I now merit that honor more than at any former period ; because I have now told him *truths*, which nobody else would tell him, and to know which truths is of far more importance to him than the support of all the tribe, who have the insolence to give themselves the exclusive appellation of *King’s Friends* ; and who, in an hour of danger to his person or his throne, would, as all the sycophants of the Continent have done, desert him, while, I trust, I should be found ready to hazard my life in his defence. There is no man, in this country, who shall read what I am now writing, that will not acknowledge, that he has a thousand times heard it observed, that “ there is *no knowing what may happen*,” upon an event, which we all hope may be distant, but, which we are all sure, must, in the course of nature, take place. I put it to the Reader, whether this be not a subject of general anxiety ? Whether he be acquainted with *one considerate man*, who does not partake in this anxiety ? Is it not, therefore, for those, who really wish for the stability of the kingly government, and for the unimpaired authority of the king and his successors, to use their best endeavours to see things settled upon a solid foundation, *before the event, alluded to, takes place* ? It surely is ; and, as I am one of those, who think that the only means of obtaining that solidity is to give the people confidence in their Representatives, and thereby reconcile them to their sacrifices, I wish for a Reform of the Commons’ House of Parliament.—Nothing, to me, at least, can be more evident than this : that, to insure the stability of the throne, a Reform in the House of Commons is absolutely necessary. The people, if fairly and fully represented, would grudge nothing to the king, or to his family ; and, indeed, that which has recently given so much anxiety and pain to the royal family, may be clearly traced to the same source, whence all the other heart-burnings may be traced. Those, who have dealt in parliamentary

seats, always make common cause with the king; always drag him into the party with them, by accusing their opponents of being *his* enemies; when the fact manifestly is, that the king's legitimate authority, his dignity and his just prerogatives, suffer by such dealings as much as the rights and liberties of the people suffer by them.—There is something in the heart of every man, which impels him to desire, that the person, whom he acknowledges as his *sovereign*, should be clothed with dignity; and, does it not naturally follow, that it must be mortifying to a sensible and honourable people, to see the authority of the king cramped and thwarted by the owners of Boroughs? If, agreeably to the principles of the constitution, the people were represented; if they had nothing to complain of upon this score; never would they wish to interfere with the prerogatives of the king. They love kingly government; and they grudge the king and his family nothing in the way of splendour. It is notorious, that *royal economy* is no favourite virtue with them. But they love their own rights and liberties, without which nothing will make them heartily contented.—Look at the *Pension* and *Sinecure* Lists, those lists which create so much well-grounded complaint. Look at the persons, upon whom the public money is heaped. This, observe, is all done in the name of the *king*. Is this doing justice to the king? Is it doing justice to his present Majesty to hold him forth to his people as having, for instance, bestowed *one thousand five hundred pounds a year* of their money upon *Mrs. Fox*? Will any man deny, that it would be an act the most friendly to the king to set him free from that, the existence of which, and of which alone, could have induced him to put his royal signature to such a grant? Is there a man in the whole kingdom, who can believe, that the king *cheerfully* put his signature to that grant? Yet, he is held forth to his people as having been the author of it; as having made such a grant, in the virtue of a power given him by the constitution for the purpose of supporting the *honour* and *dignity* of his throne!—It is worthy of remark that each party, when out of power, complain of “the *influence of the CROWN*;” of the vast sums of money, and the great number of offices, which “the CROWN” has in its gift. This is a very convenient notion to be inculcated by those, who can dispose of seats, and who can force ministers upon the king. To them it is very conve-

nient to represent all that the people dislike as proceeding from the royal will, and, of course, to cause it to be believed, that, in order to get rid of such grants as that to *Mrs. Fox*, and such concerns as those of the *Dutch Commissioners*, we must first get rid of the king, which they know the people would think of with horror. The *borough* influence they never wish us to look at; but, can any man believe that, if it had not been for that influence, the present king would not have driven from his presence the man, who had such a disregard for the feelings of both king and people as to propose the grant to *Mrs. Fox*?—Now, by way of illustration, suppose the king had spurned at this proposition. The consequence would have been the going out of the ministry, who, upon such a point, would, in all probability, have retained their majority in the House. But, upon the supposition that the free voice of his people had been appealed to, would not they, by their choice of members, have expressed their gratitude to him for his care of their interest and their honour?—That man, therefore, is the real friend of the king, of his family, his office and dignity, who would free them, for ever, from all influence of this sort; who would leave the king unencumbered with any influence, other than that of the advice of his constitutional counsellors, to make such appointments and grant such favours as he himself should choose; and, I am persuaded, that if what I am now writing should ever reach the ear of his Majesty, he will, upon a due consideration of the matter, still call me, as he is said to have done at Cuffnells, his “*friend Cobbett*.”

---

There are several subjects, which press forward for observation; but, nothing appeared to me of, comparatively, any importance, at this particular moment, but the subject of Parliamentary Reform. What they are doing in Austria, or in Spain, is of little consequence to us, unless it be really true, that, in the latter country, the *Cortez*, or *representatives of the people*, are, at last, to be assembled. If this be the case, though late, there may be some hope.—The new *loan* and new *taxes* would be worthy of remark; but, really, people are wearied of discussion, where discussion can be of no avail.

---

#### WESTMINSTER ELECTION, 1807.

Report of the Committee who conducted the Election, to their Constituents, as-

ssembled on the 23rd May, 1809, to celebrate the second Anniversary of the Return of Sir Francis Burdett.

Your Committee have observed with much satisfaction, that the conduct you adopted at the Election, the result of which you are now met to celebrate, has been imperceptibly forcing itself upon the consideration of all thinking men.

In many parts of the Country a disposition to follow that example has been publicly manifested; and in some you have been awarded public thanks for the noble stand you made in support of principles, without which our boasted Constitution is but an empty form.

Your Committee call to your recollection, that, previous to the first Anniversary, the High Bailiff of Westminster had obtained a verdict against your Representative, sir Francis Burdett, for a share of certain expences attending the election of Members of Parliament, under pretence that he was a Candidate, which he was not, and had had the use of the hustings; and also that your Committee had endeavoured to obtain the reconsideration of that verdict, by applying for a new trial, which had been refused by the Court of King's Bench. The consequence of these proceedings has been an expence of upwards of 320*l.* which the contributions of individual electors, and the liberality of other friends to the purity of election, has enabled your Committee in great part to discharge. Since that period actions have been brought by an individual against three of your Committee, under pretence of expences said to be authorised by one or other of them on account of the election. It did not appear on the trial that any such expenditure had been directed by them, or that the disbursement had actually been made by the plaintiff: and, in point of fact, no order for such expenditure was given, it being contrary to the principle and uniform practice of your Committee. The plaintiff, who sued as a pauper, was non-suited; but your Committee were put to the expence of about 70*l.* for costs, in the defence of these actions, which they have no hope of recovering. These are the principal items of charge since the last Anniversary, and your Committee now lay before you the present state of your accounts:—

Expences of Chairing, Procession, and presenting the Car to Sir F. Burdett .....	507 19 2
of Fees and Gratuities at the House of Commons .....	6 2 6
of Printing an "Exposition of the Conduct of the Committee" during the Election .....	28 10 1
1808	
attending the celebration of the First Anniversary .....	31 16 0
of Verdict, Costs, and Execution levied in an Action brought by the High Bailiff against Sir F. Burdett ...	321 0 8
1809	
incurred in defence of three Actions brought by Smith (a pauper) against the Committee .....	68 7 3
of collecting Subscriptions and Meetings of the Committee .....	11 17 0
	£.1,756 7 0
Amount of Subscriptions received by the Treasurer to the 7th Aug. 1807.....	1,215 14 3
Ditto, to the 23d May, 1809 456 19 0	1,672 13 3

Leaving a balance due to the Treasurer of 83 13 9 which your Committee cannot doubt your readiness to make good.

This debt has been incurred in carrying into effect the Resolution of the 4th May, 1807, "to return sir Francis Burdett to Parliament, free from every expence to himself."

Your Committee are not insensible to the effect which this great and glorious example is calculated to produce on the people of England, and it will be your duty to persevere and follow up that example which yourselves have set; but they cannot conceal that the elective franchise does not permit that example to be so followed as to produce any important numerical effect in the House of Commons, though they may justly hope that it will even there be viewed with respect.

Your Committee would willingly hope that the sense of the people, peaceably expressed, and supported by a few honest and real Representatives, who shall faithfully persevere in exposing corruption (however attempted to be excused by that general prevalence which increases its enormity), will ultimately succeed in rendering it so disgraceful, that those most interested will be compelled by shame to abandon its defence. In the mean time, you will, however, have the heart-felt satisfaction of having done your duty, and the honour of holding up to public imitation, even in times when corruption is officially acknowledged and defended, one

#### ACCOUNT OF DISBURSEMENTS AND RECEIPTS.

1807	£. s. d.
Expences of the Election to the final close of the Poll .....	780 14 4

example of purity, and of keeping alive that spirit of liberty, which alone can tend to regain for the people of England the blessings of the Constitution to which they are entitled.

### PROCEEDINGS

*In COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &c. relative to the recent INQUIRY in the House of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK. (Continued from p. 798.)*

#### BOROUGH OF WARWICK.

At a respectable Meeting of the Burgesses and Inhabitants of the Borough of Warwick, held at the Court-House, on Tuesday, 16th May, 1809, pursuant to a Requisition presented to the Mayer for that purpose: — THOMAS COLLINS, esq., Mayor, in the Chair:

It was Resolved unanimously—

1. That the Inquiry in the House of Commons, relative to the conduct of his Royal Highness the late Commander in Chief, has proved, to the conviction of the whole country, the existence of flagrant abuses in the administration of public affairs—most disgraceful in themselves to the British name—and most injurious in their effects to the prosperity of the British Nation.

2. That the Thanks of this Meeting be presented to Gwyllim Lloyd Wardle, esq., for his intrepidity in commencing, and his firmness and moderation in conducting that Investigation, which has eventually turned the attention of an indignant people towards a System of Corruption, which no plea of prescription can justify—no sophistry can palliate—no intrigues of party can long shelter from detection and disgrace.

3. That the Thanks of this Meeting are due to the 125 Members of the House of Commons, who by their conduct in the progress, and by their vote at the conclusion of the late Inquiry, have proved themselves the wise and faithful friends, both of the Sovereign and of the People.

4. That the late decision of the House of Commons, standing in direct opposition to the clear and decided opinion, and offering the grossest violence to all the best feelings of the nation, exhibits a most striking and melancholy proof of the present imperfect Representation of the People in Parliament.

5. That in the opinion of this Meeting, a timely, temperate, and well-conducted plan of Parliamentary Reform can alone afford an effectual security against all

great and dangerous abuses in the various departments of government—and that by restoring to the House of Commons its constitutional and rightful character of being a fair and faithful Representation of the People, such Reform would render that body amiable and venerable in the estimation of their constituents—would contribute essentially to the happiness and true glory of the Sovereign—would give their due weight to property, talent, and virtue in the Senate—and promote the collective interest of a free, enlightened, and generous nation.

6. That these Resolutions be signed by the Chairman in behalf of the Meeting, and a copy thereof transmitted to G. L. Wardle, esq.

#### COUNTY OF CORNWALL.

At a numerous and respectable Meeting of Gentlemen, Clergy, Freeholders, and other Inhabitants of the County of Cornwall, held at Bodmin, in the said county, on Monday, the 15th inst. in pursuance of public notice given for that purpose, EDWARD COODE, gent. Under-sheriff (in the absence of the High Sheriff) in the Chair:

Resolved, 1st. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq., for his manly and patriotic exertions in bringing forward his Charges against the Duke of York, and for instituting an Inquiry in the course of which the evil practices that have prevailed in the corrupt disposal of Promotions in the Army, have been exposed, and by which the Duke of York has been compelled to resign.

2nd. That the Thanks of this Meeting are particularly due to those Members of Parliament, who by their personal exertions, or by voting in the Minority of 125, afforded unqualified and efficient support to Mr. Wardle in these laudable undertakings.

3rd. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the Representatives of the county, and to all those Members who voted in the Minorities upon the other questions relative to the Duke of York, upon which the House of Commons divided.

4th. That in the opinion of this Meeting the decision of the House of Commons, "that there was no ground to charge his Royal Highness with any connivance at the corrupt and infamous practices discovered in the evidence," is contrary to the general sense of the nation.

5th. That Corruptions notoriously exist

in other departments of the state, as brought to light by different Committees of the House of Commons.

6th. That the state of the public mind, the example and fate of the nations on the Continent (particularly of France) and the critical situation of the country with respect to foreign powers, imperiously demand a system of constitutional reformation.

7th. That in the opinion of this Meeting the corruptions which have been suffered to accumulate to so grievous an extent in this country, are to be traced to the defective state of the representation.

8th. That it is therefore the firm conviction of this Meeting that a Reform in the Representation of the People in the Commons' House of Parliament is the only effective corrective of existing abuses, and that the only security against future corruptions will be the restoring to the people that share of the elective franchise which the public good requires, and to which they are entitled by the principles of the British Constitution.

#### *Protest against the Resolutions.*

We the undersigned, do hereby solemnly enter our Protest against the Resolutions relating to a Reform in Parliament entered into at the County Meeting held at Bodmin, on Monday, the 15th of May 1809, as tending in our opinion to results the most mischievous to the existing constitution and the safety of the country.—Eliot, De Dunstanville, &c. F. Grégor, Francis Glanville, F. Hearle Rodd, Wymond Cory, W. Morshed, Edward Rodd, Thomas Graham, Charles Mayson, W. S. Gully, S. Gurney, William Paul, Ph. Carlyon, C. T. Kempe, John Baron, William Baker, John Pomeroy, John Edyeau, P. S. Pomeroy, H. Rogers, W. Rashleigh, Davies Giddy, John Row, J. A. Norway, John Arthur, F. O'Degherty, N. Norway, William Ball, Edmund Gilbert, Thomas Hichens, John Rickard, Joseph Hawkey, Charles Rashleigh, William Reynolds, J. Hext, J. J. Keigwin, John Rogers, jun. William Gregror, John Every, J. W. Colenso, Robert Flamank, Thomas Robins, R. K. Frost, John Wallis, Thomas Penwarne, E. Hobbling, William Pye, Lewis Marshall, W. Burrows, Edmund Cartheu.

sible to preserve peace by means of sacrifices, and as long as these sacrifices were consistent with the honour of the throne, with the security of the state, and with the welfare of the people, the heart of our bountiful sovereign suppressed every painful feeling in silence; but when all endeavours to preserve happy independence from the insatiable ambition of a foreign conqueror prove fruitless, when nations are falling around us, and when lawful sovereigns are torn from the hearts of their subjects, when in fine the danger of universal subjugation threatens even the happy states of Austria, and their peaceable fortunate inhabitants; then does our country demand its deliverance from us, and we stand forth in its defence.—On you, my dear brother soldiers, are fixed the eyes of the universe, and of all those who still feel for national honours and national prosperity. You shall not share the disgrace of becoming the tools of oppression. You shall not carry on the endless wars of ambition under distant climes. Your blood shall never flow for foreign fleets and foreign covetousness; not on you shall the curse alight to annihilate innocent nations? and over the bodies of the slaughtered defenders of their country to pave the way for a foreigner to the usurped throne. A happier lot awaits you; the liberty of Europe has taken refuge under our banners. Your victories will loose its fetters, and your brothers in Germany, yet in the ranks of the enemy, long for their deliverance. You are engaged in a just cause, otherwise I should not appear at your head.—On the fields of Ulm and Marengo, whereof the enemy so often remind us with ostentatious pride, on these fields will we renew the glorious deeds of Wartsburgh and Ostrach, of Liptingen (Steckach), and Zurich, of Verona, of the Trebbia and Novi. We will conquer a lasting peace for our country; but the great aim is not to be attained without great virtues. Unconditional subordination, strict discipline, persevering courage, and unshaken steadiness in danger, are the companions of true fortitude. Only a union of will, and a joint co-operation of the whole, lead to victory.—My sovereign and brother has invested me with extensive powers to reward and to punish. I will be every where in the middle of you, and you shall receive the first thanks of your country from your general on the field of battle. The patriotism of many of the Austrian nobility has anticipated your wants: this is a pledge in the fullest

---

#### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

AUSTRIA.—*Proclamation of the Archduke Charles, dated Vienna, April 6, 1809.*

THE protection of our country calls us to new exploits. As long as it was pos-

measure, of the public gratitude: but punishment shall also, with inflexible rigour, fall on every breach of duty: merit shall meet with reward, and offence with animadversion, without distinction of person, or rank; branded with disgrace shall the worthless person be cast out to whom life is dearer than his and our honour. Adorned with the marks of public esteem, will I present to our sovereign, to the world, those brave men who have deserved well of their country, and whose names I will ever carry in my heart.—There remains one consideration, which I must put you in mind of: the soldier is only formidable to the enemy in arms; civil virtues must not be strangers to him: out of the field of battle, towards the unarmed citizens and peasants, he is moderate, compassionate, and humane: he knows the evils of war, and strives to lighten them; I will punish every wanton excess with so much greater severity, as it is not the intention of our monarch to oppress neighbouring countries, but to deliver them from their oppressors, and to form with their princes a powerful bond in order to bring about a lasting peace, and to maintain the general welfare and security. Soon will foreign troops, in strict union with us, attack the common enemy. Then, brave companions in arms! honour and support them as your brothers; not vain glorious high words but manly deeds do honour to the warrior; by intrepidity before the enemy you must shew yourselves to be the first soldiers.—Thus then shall I one day lead you back to your own country, followed by the respect of the enemy, and by the gratitude of foreign nations, after having secured by your arms an honourable peace, when the satisfaction of our monarch, the approbation of the world, the rewards of valour, the blessings of your fellow citizens, and the consciousness of deserved repose await you —

CHARLES, Archduke, Generalissimo.

FRENCH ARMY.—*First Bulletin, dated Ratisbon, Apr. 24, 1809.*

THE Austrian army passed the Inn on the 9th April; that was the signal for hostilities, and Austria declared an implacable war against France and her Allies, and the Confederation of the Rhine.—The following were the positions of the French army and her Allies:—The corps of the duke D'Auerstadt at Ratisbon. The corps of gen. Oudinot at Augsburgh. The headquarters at Straubburgh. The three divi-

sions of Bavarians under the duke of Dantzig, were placed as follows: The first division, commanded by the Prince Royal, at Munich; the second, by gen. Deroi, at Landshut; and the third, by gen. de Wrede, at Straubburgh. The Wurtemburgh division at Heydenheim. The Saxon troops encamped under the walls of Dresden. The corps of the duchy of Warsaw, commanded by prince Poniatowsky, in the environs of Warsaw.—On the 10th the Austrian troops invested Passau, where they surrounded a battalion of Bavarians, and at the same time invested Kufstein, where there was another battalion of Bavarians; these movements took place without even a shot being fired. The Austrians published the subjoined Proclamation in the Tyrol. The Bavarian court quitted Munich for Dillingen. The Bavarian division which had been at Landshut went to Altorf, on the left bank of the Iser. The division under the command of general de Wrede marched upon Neustadt.—The duke of Rivoli left Ulm for the environs of Augsburgh. From the 10th to the 16th the enemy's army advanced from the Inn to the Iser; there were several skirmishes between parties of the cavalry, in which the Bavarians were successful.—On the 16th, at Pfaffenhoffen, the 2d and 3d regiments of Bavarian light horse completely routed the hussars of Stipschitz and the Rosenberg dragoons. At the same time the enemy appeared in large bodies for the purpose of forming at Landshut, the bridge was broken down, and the Bavarian division commanded by general Durroy vigorously opposed this movement of the enemy, but being threatened by the columns which had passed the Iser at Moorberg and Freysing, this division retired in good order upon that of general Wrede, and the Bavarian army took a central position upon Neustadt.

*Departure of the Emperor from Paris on the 13th.*

The Emperor learnt by the telegraph in the evening of the 12th, that the Austrians had passed the Inn, and he set out from Paris almost immediately. He arrived at three o'clock on the morning of the 16th at Louisburg, and in the evening of the same day at Dillingen, where he saw the king of Bavaria, and passed half an hour with that prince, and promised in 15 days to restore him to his capital, to revenge the insults which had been offered to his house, and to make him greater than any of his ancestors had ever been. On the 17th, at two o'clock in the morn-

ing, his Majesty arrived at Donauworth, where he immediately established his head-quarters, and gave the necessary orders. On the 18th the head-quarters were removed to Ingolstadt.

*Battle of Pfaffenhoffen on the 19th.*

On the 19th general Oudinot quitted Augsburg and arrived by break of day at Pfaffenhoffen, where he met three or four thousand Austrians, which he attacked, and took three hundred prisoners. The duke de Rivoli arrived the next day at Pfaffenhoffen. The same day the duke of Auerstadt left Ratisbon to advance to Neu-stadt, and to draw near to Ingolstadt. It was then evident that the plan of the Emperor was to out-maneuvre the enemy, who had formed near Landshut, and to attack them at the very moment when they, thinking they were commencing the attack, were marching to Ratisbon.

*Battle of Tann, on the 19th.*

On the 19th, by break of day, the duke D'Auerstadt began his march in two columns. The divisions of Moraud and Gudin formed his right, the divisions of St. Hillaire and Friant formed his left. The division of St. Hillaire arrived at the village of Pressing, and there met the enemy, superior in number, but inferior in bravery, and there the campaign was opened by a battle, which was most glorious to our arms. General St. Hillaire, supported by general Friant, overturned every thing that was opposed to him, and took all the positions of the enemy, killed a great number of them, and made between 6 and 700 prisoners.—The 72d regiment distinguished itself on that day, the 57th maintained its ancient reputation. Sixteen years ago this regiment obtained in Italy the name of the Terrible. In this action they maintained their pretensions to that title; they attacked singly six Austrian regiments in succession, and routed them. On the left, at two o'clock in the afternoon, gen. Moraud also fell in with an Austrian division, which he attacked in front, while the duke of Dantzic, with a corps of Bavarians, which had marched from Abensberg, attacked them in the rear. This division was soon driven from all its positions, and left several hundreds in killed and prisoners. The whole regiment of the dragoons of Levenher was destroyed, and its colonel killed by the Bavarian light-horse. At sun-set the division of the duke of Dantzic formed its junction with that of the duke of Auerstadt. In all these affairs generals St. Hillaire and Friant particularly distinguished themselves. Those unfortunate

Austrian troops who had been led from Vienna with music and with songs, and under a persuasion that there was no longer any French army in Germany, and that they would only have to deal with Wirtemburghers and Bavarians, displayed in the strongest manner, the resentment they felt against their chiefs, for the error into which they had been led; and their terror was the greater when they saw those old bands which they had been accustomed to consider as their master.—In all these battles our loss was inconsiderable, compared with that of the enemy, who lost a number of general officers and others, who were obliged to put themselves forward to give courage to their troops. The prince of Lichtenstein, general Lusignan, and others were wounded. The loss of the Austrians in colonels and officers of lower rank was considerable.

*Battle of Abensberg on the 20th.*

The Emperor resolved to beat and destroy the corps of the archduke Louis and gen. Keller, which amounted to 60,000 men. On the 20th, his majesty took post at Abensberg; he gave orders to the duke of Auerstadt to keep the corps of Hohenzollern, of Rosenberg, and Lichtenstein, in check, while with the two divisions of Moraud and Gudin, the Bavarians and the Wirtemburghers, he attacked the army of the archduke Louis and general Keller in front, and caused the communications of the enemy to be cut off by the duke of Rivoli, who passed by Freyberg, and from thence proceeded to the rear of the Austrian army. The divisions of Moraud and Gudin formed the left, and manœuvred under the orders of the duke of Montebello. The Emperor determined to fight that day at the head of the Bavarians and Wirtemburghers. He ordered the officers of these two armies to form a circle, and addressed them in a long speech. The Prince Royal of Bavaria translated into German what he said in French. The Emperor made them sensible of the confidence which he reposed in them. He told the Bavarian officers that the Austrians had always been their enemies, that they now wished to destroy their independence; that for more than 200 years, the Bavarian standard had been displayed against the Austrians. But at this time he would render them so powerful that they alone should be able to contend with the house of Austria. He spoke to the Wirtemburghers of the victories they had obtained over the house of Austria, when they served in the Prussian army, and of

the advantages which they had recently obtained from the campaign in Silesia. He told them all, that the moment was come for carrying the war into the Austrian territory. This speech was repeated to the different companies by the captains, which produced an effect which may easily be conceived. The Emperor then gave the signal for battle, and planned his manœuvres according to the particular character of the troops. General Wrede, a Bavarian officer of great merit, was stationed at Siegenburgh, and attacked an Austrian division, which was opposed to him. General Vandamme, who commanded the Wirtemburghers, attacked the enemy on their right flank. The duke of Dantzig, with the division of the Prince Royal, and that of general Deroy, marched toward the village of Renhausen, in order to reach the grand road from Abensberg to Landshut. The duke of Montebello, with his two French divisions, forced the extremity of the enemy's left, and overthrew every thing that was opposed to him, and advanced to Rohr and Rosemburgh. Our cannonade was successful on all points. The enemy, disconcerted by our movements, did not fight for more than an hour, and then beat a retreat. Eight standards, 12 pieces of cannon, and 18,000 prisoners, were the result of this affair, which cost us but a few men.

*The Battle of Landshut, and taking of that place.*

The battle of Landshut having laid open the flank of the Austrian army, and all their magazines, the Emperor, by break of day, on the 21st, marched upon Landshut. The duke of Istria defeated the enemy's cavalry in the plain before that city. The general of division Mouten, made the grenadiers of the 17th advance to the charge on the bridge, forming the head of a column. This bridge, which was of wood, was set on fire, but that was not an obstacle to our infantry, who forced it, and penetrated into the city. The enemy, driven from their position, were then attacked by the duke of Rivoli, who had advanced by the right bank. Landshut fell into our power, and with Landshut we took 30 pieces of cannon, 9,000 prisoners, 600 ammunition waggons, 3,000 baggage waggons, and the hospitals and

magazines which the Austrians had began to form. Some couriers and aides-de-camp of the commander in chief, prince Charles, and some convoys of wounded men, coming from Landshut, also fell into our hands.

*Battle of Echmuhl, on the 22d.*

While the battle of Abensberg and that of Landshut produced such important consequences, the archduke Charles had formed a junction with the Bohemian army under Kollowrath, and obtained some partial success at Ratisbon. One thousand of the 65th, who were left to guard the bridge of Ratisbon, and who had not received orders to retreat, having expended their cartridges, and being surrounded by the Austrians, were obliged to surrender. This event made an impression upon the Emperor, and he swore that in 24 hours Austrian blood should flow in Ratisbon to resent the insult which had been offered to his arms. During this time the dukes of Auerstadt and Dantzig held in check the corps of Rosenberg, Hohenzollern, and Lichtenstein. There was no time to be lost. The Emperor began his march from Landshut, with the two divisions of the duke of Montebello, the corps of the duke of Rivoli, the cuirassiers of Nansoutz and St. Sulpice, and the Wirtemburgh division. At two o'clock in the afternoon they arrived opposite Echmuhl, where the four corps of the Austrian army, consisting of 110,000 men, had taken a position under the command of the archduke Charles. The duke of Montebello attacked the enemy on the left, with the division of Gudin. On the first signal the divisions of the dukes of Auerstadt and Dantzig, and the division of light cavalry of general Montbrun, took their position. One of the most beautiful sights which war can present then presented itself, 110,000 men attacked on all points, turned on their left, and successively driven from all their positions, the detail of the events would be too long; it is sufficient to say, that the enemy were completely routed; that they lost the greater part of their cannon, and a great number of prisoners; and that the Austrians, driven from the woods which cover Ratisbon, were forced into the plain, and cut off by cavalry.

*(To be continued.)*

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 22.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 3, 1809.

[Price 1s.

S33] BLACKSTONE and LOCKE. [S34

" As it is essential to the very being of Parliament that Elections should be free, therefore, all undue influences upon the electors are illegal, and strongly prohibited; for Mr. Locke ranks it amongst those breaches of trust in the executive magistrate, which, according to his notions, amounts to a dissolution of government, if he employ the force, treasure, and offices of the society to corrupt the representatives, or openly to pre-engage the electors, and prescribe what manner of persons shall be chosen; for, thus to regulate candidates and electors, and new-model the ways of election, what is it but to cut up the government by the roots, and poison the very fountain of public security."—BLACKSTONE'S COMMENTARIES ON THE LAWS OF ENGLAND: Book I. Chap. 2.

## EARL MULGRAVE.

" But, my lords, there is another kind of incapacity worse than this, I mean that of parliament men's having such places in the exchequer, as the very profit of them depends on the money given to the King in parliament. Would any of your lordships entrust a man to make a bargain for you, whose very interest is to make you give as much as he possibly can? It puts me in mind of a farce where an actor holds a dialogue with himself, first speaking in one tone, and then answering himself in another."—EARL MULGRAVE'S SPEECH, in the House of Lords, Dec. 22, 1692. *Cobbett's Parl. Hist. vol. 5. p. 749.*

## THE GREAT LORD CHATHAM.

MR. PITT, when contending for a Reform in Parliament, in 1782, told the House, that he personally knew, that it was the opinion of his father, that, " without recurring to first principles in this respect, and establishing a more solid and equal representation of the people, by which the proper constitutional connection should be revived, this nation, with the best capacities for grandeur and happiness of any on the face of the earth, must be confounded with the mass of those whose liberties were lost in the corruption of the people."

## MR. PITT.

" THE defect of representation is the national disease; and unless you apply a remedy directly to that disease, you must inevitably take the consequences with which it is pregnant. Without a parliamentary Reform the nation will be plunged into new wars; without a parliamentary Reform you cannot be safe against bad ministers, nor can even good ministers be of use to you. No honest man can, according to the present system, continue minister."—MR. PITT'S SPEECH, 1782.

## MR. FOX.

" THE whole of this system as it is now carried on, is as outrageous to morality as it is pernicious to just government; it gives a scandal to our character, which not merely degrades the House of Commons in the eyes of the people, but it does more; it undermines the very principles of integrity in their hearts, and gives a fashion to dishonesty and imposture. They hear of a person giving or receiving four or five thousand pounds as the purchase-money of a seat for a close borough; and they hear the very man who received and put into his pocket the money, make a loud and vehement speech in this House against Bribery; and they see him, perhaps, move for the commitment to prison of a poor unfortunate wretch at your bar, who has been convicted of taking a single guinea for his vote in the very borough, perhaps, where he had publicly and unblushingly sold his influence, though that

" miserable guinea was necessary to save a family from starving under the horrors of a war which he had contributed to bring upon the country. . . . . These are the things that paralyse you to the heart: these are the things that vitiate the whole system, that spread degeneracy, hypocrisy, and sordid fraud over the country, and take from us the energies of virtue, and sap the foundations of patriotism and spirit."—*MR. FOX'S SPEECH, 1797.*

#### MR. GREY (now EARL GREY).

" Has the House of Commons shown either vigilance of inquiry, or independence of spirit? Have they investigated the origin of their misfortunes, or checked ministers in their ruinous career? Nay, the very reverse. In a war remarkable only for misfortune, and distinguished on our part solely by disgrace, they have suffered ministers to go on from failure to failure, adding misfortune to misfortune, and madness to folly, without either investigation or inquiry.—As a remedy for these evils, Mr. Grey recommended ' a Reform of Parliament; and to obviate the charge of making complaints without prescribing some specific mode of relief, he proposed, that instead of 92 county members there should be 113, and that the right of voting should be extended to copyholders and leaseholders who are bound to pay rent for a certain number of years. To prevent compromises he proposed that every county should be divided into grand divisions, each of which should return a representative. He also proposed that the remaining 400 members should be returned by householders.' "—*MR. GREY'S SPEECH in 1797.*

#### MR. WINDHAM.

" MANY join in the cry of Reform from ignorance, many from folly, many from fanaticism. Some are incited by the vilest passions, and some from more pure, but not less dangerous principles. Numerous are the knaves and numerous the dupes desirous of change."—*MR. WINDHAM'S SPEECH, in the House of Commons, 26 May, 1809.*

#### MR. CURWEN'S MOTION.

ON Friday, the 26th of May, there was a debate, in the House of Commons, upon the motion of MR. CURWEN for passing a law, imposing an *oath* upon members of that House, as to their not having paid, or bargained, for their seats.—This debate, which, as reported in the news-papers, contained much interesting matter, is well worthy of general attention.—*MR. WINDHAM* is reported to have used the words, contained in the last of the passages above-quoted, by way of mottos to this sheet. If the report be correct, and, I believe it to be so, pray, Sir, let me ask you, since you set down for knaves, or dupes, all those, who wish for a reform of the House of Commons; let me ask you, whether you regard as knaves, or as dupes, Locke, Blackstone, the old Earl Mulgrave, Lord Chatham, Mr. Pitt, Mr. Fox, and the present Lord Grey? Now, do, with your usual frankness, and contempt of disguise and reserve, pray say, whether they belong to the knavish or the foolish tribe; for, to one or the other, if your assertion be true, they must belong; and, then, it will follow, that you have been voluntarily very closely connected with knaves, or fools;

for you have sitten in the same cabinet with the three latter of the persons named.—As there was nothing but bare assertion in this part of Mr. Windham's speech, it will require no further comment; for, though the authority of names is not sufficient in answer to argument, it is quite so in answer to bare assertion, and is, indeed, more than bare assertion is entitled to.—It appears to be a favourite plan with Mr. Windham to represent the *electors* as the *source* of corruption; as if the elector would bargain for a price for his vote, if there were no one ready to give him that price. But, be it so; let it be admitted, that it is from the vile miscreants, who sell their votes, that political corruption springs; for, what better argument need we in support of such a reform as shall render it impossible for any wretch to find a market for his vote? —*MR. WINDHAM* says, that some Attorney, or Brewer, being refused a place for his son, feels himself instantly glowing with patriotism: his honesty is roused: he takes the independent side, and runs to the hustings bawling full-mouthed against corruption.—Well, this may be very true of the Attorney and the Brewer, and of thousands besides; but, is not this ano-

ther argument for a reform in the representation? Is not this disgraceful state of things the natural result of the present system? Could there possibly exist any case like that supposed by Mr. Windham, if the system of election were such as that proposed by Lord Grey? That there could not every one must be satisfied; and, therefore, unless Mr. Windham likes the character and conduct of his Attorney or Brewer, he must, one would think, wish for such a change as would extinguish such characters.—There is one passage in Mr. Windham's speech, which, I must confess, astonished me beyond measure. He makes a comparison between the sacrifices made by Sir Francis Burdett and by those whom he opposed, and represented as selfish; and instancing Mr. Pitt, he is reported to have said, that Mr. Pitt gave a “proof of his magnanimity in leaving office, in 1801, which had become almost a second nature to him, because he could not *conscientiously* abandon a measure, to which he had pledged himself.” This did astonish me. The selection was so very unfortunate; for, it is notorious to the whole nation, that Mr. Pitt came into that same office again, three years afterwards, without making any attempt to redeem that pledge; and, further; that he united with his former opponents for the purpose of turning out the man, whom he had prevailed upon to take his place, under a promise of giving him his support. Nay, does not Mr. Windham well know, that, after Mr. Pitt had regained his place and his power, he resisted an application for the adoption of the very measure, which Mr. Windham says he left his place because he could not *conscientiously* abandon when he was in power before. Will Mr. Windham say, that the *times* or the *circumstances* were changed? If he does, then we ask him, how he came to press the measure in the last instance; to insist that Mr. Pitt was bound by his former pledge, and to reproach him with an abandonment of that pledge?—This, I think, is pretty complete: a happy instance of Mr. Pitt's “magnanimity;” a lucky hit at Sir Francis Burdett: a most striking proof of Sir Francis's injustice in denominating Pitt the link of corruption.

Leaving Mr. Windham to a full and undisturbed enjoyment of this triumph, let us go to the reported speech of Mr. TIERNEY, which has not only been published in the report, in the common course, but republished separately.—A great deal of the speech related to Mr. Tierney him-

self, and some part of that I shall notice; but, first, let us look at what this gentleman is reported to have said respecting those in general, who wish for a reform in parliament. These are the words attributed to him in the report. “If the design of the noble lord who had just sat down was to prove himself an honest man, he might just as well have remained silent, for certain persons would never think either him or any one else so, who did not acquiesce in all the chimeras of the hon. baronet (*Hear! hear! hear!*) It was the design of him and his friends to excite such an opinion among the people; and he believed, in his soul, it was also their wish not to have many supporters in that house, lest their designs should fail, and the public would begin to think too favourably of the house. It was their desire to raise a popular ferment, by talking of abuses which often had no existence, and by vaunting of remedies which they never meant to put in execution! Far was it from their thoughts to come manfully and constitutionally down to that house and state their complaints, if any such they really had. No, it suited them better to make harangues at taverns, to mount the tables at the Crown and Anchor, to tell the people to meet as people, and look not for redress to their representatives, who were no longer fit to be called an House of Commons. It was their plan to raise a cry by which the infatuated people might be hurried to their ruin, by hinting at corruptions which never had existence, and rousing expectations which never could be gratified.”—Of all the charges that the mind of man is capable of inventing, I should have thought, that the charge of clamouring against undefined abuses and corruptions was the very last, which any man would have thought of, as applicable to the conduct of sir Francis Burdett, Mr. Wardle, Mr. Madocks, and the others, who wish for a reform of the House of Commons. This is the very last charge, which one would now expect to hear from those, who, four months ago, cried out for joy at the appearance of something in a “tangible shape.” Have these gentlemen contented themselves with “hinting” at corruptions? Have they dealt in broad and general imputations? Had the abuses, of which Mr. Wardle complained, “no existence?” Was there no ground for the charge of Mr. Madocks? Have these gentlemen “deluded” the people with

falshoods? Have they not “come manfully down to the House and stated the complaints of themselves and the people?”

—The public will answer these questions; they already have answered them; and Mr. Tierney may be assured, that the answer has been such as is warranted by truth, and not by that falshood, which his speech imputes to those who wish for a reform. What! is it at *this* day, that we are to be told, that abuses and corruptions are *imaginary*? Who would have thought, that *any* man would have told us this now?

—Mr. Tierney, adverting to what Mr. Wardle had said, at the Crown and Anchor, about the *saving in the public expence*, which would be produced by a Reform in the representation of the people, is reported to have observed thereon, that “one hon. gent. of the worthy baronet’s friends” (Mr. Wardle) had made a great dis-“covery it appear’d—he was to *demolish* “the Income Tax! (a laugh). Now he liked this—indeed he never was so pleased in his life as when he first heard of the discovery. It was the pleasantest way of laying the axe to the root he had ever imagined. (*Hear! hear!*) He was sure it would gratify the Chancellor of the Exchequer wonderfully to be able to *strike off eleven million and a half of taxes*. Now he had at last found out the reason why the hon. gentleman and the Chancellor of the Exchequer were perpetually complimenting each other. No doubt they were pulling together all this time. Indeed if the plan was realized, it would be exceedingly diverting; but if it was only a fallacious assertion held out for the wicked purpose of exciting discontent, it was one of the vilest and most execrable insinuations. He now called upon that hon. gent. to produce his plan, or stand convicted in the face of the world.”—Something of this sort was repeated by Mr. BARHAM; and, it is a second chapter of the *threats*, pronounced against Mr. Wardle when he brought forward his Charges against the Duke of York. He is to “stand convicted” unless he can prove, that a Reform of the House of Commons would, without any injury to the affairs of the nation, be followed by a reduction of the annual expenditure to the amount of 11 millions and a half; and he is called upon for “a plan.” This is pretty rough treatment, to be sure; but Mr. Wardle has already experienced, that such treatment does a man no harm.—A “plan?” Why, do they think, that he means to produce the saving in the way proposed by

lord Henry Petty? to produce the saving without any *diminution in the expence*? As if a saving was to be effected by a *scheme drawn out upon paper*. We have had schemes enough of that sort; quite schemes enough for that sort of saving, which is accompanied with an increase of taxation and an increase of the number of paupers; quite enough of those schemes, which, in order to pay off the national debt, causes its augmentation. What we want is a scheme for lessening the expenditure. A scheme that should put a stop to the paying of lady LOUISA PAGET 300*l.* a year, under that name, and another 300*l.* a year, under the name of Lady Louisa ERSKINE. This is the sort of scheme that we want: this is the sort of “plan,” and no other plan is worth a farthing. We have had hocus pocus plans enough; but, still the taxes go on increasing; steadily increasing, and increase they will, and must, unless retrenchment take place.—Mr. Wardle has pledged himself to *prove*, that this great saving might be made, without any injury to the nation’s affairs; but, he has not pledged himself to obtain a vote of the House of Commons, signifying, that *they* are satisfied with his proofs, any more than he so pledged himself in the case of the other day. He only says, the thing is so, and not that the House of Commons will say that it is so. What he may think *useless* expenditure, they may think *very* necessary, perhaps. As he states his items, one by one, he may be told: “Oh! you must not touch that.” And, of course, he would, in the opinion of those who differed from him, “stand convicted” of having uttered “the vilest and most execrable insinuations.” Come, says he, “lop me off this pension to Lady Louisa; stop this to Mrs. Fox and her daughters; take this immense sum from such an one, and this from another; and discharge these foreign troops; and see that no public property is disposed of in the same way as that at Chelsea, to Colonel Gordon.” But it is very clear indeed, that all those, who think that these propositions ought not to be adopted, will say: “there! there, you stand convicted in the face of the world!”—In short, as Mr. Wardle assumes, that a House of Commons, freely chosen by all those who pay taxes to the state, would save all that could be saved, without danger to the independence or honour of the nation, all he has to do, in order to make good his pledge, is to show, that the amount of the Income tax is now annually expended in a way,

which renders that expenditure of no benefit to the nation at large. This is all that he has to do; and, as to his ability to do it, all I shall say is, that I am glad his opponents have dared him to the proof.

—Mr. Tierney appears to have been very angry with something which Sir Francis Burdett had said, at the Crown and Anchor, about his, Mr. Tierney's, retiring from office with his pockets full of the public money, which he declared to be false. After much upon this point, expressive of strong resentment, the former member for Southwark is reported to have said: “It was true the worthy Baronet ‘had never been troubled with office;’ ‘the reasons for that might be various;’ ‘perhaps the cause might have been his own disinclination; perhaps his immense fortune might have exempted him from its cares; or perhaps he had never been importuned upon the subject. (*A laugh.*) ‘Certainly he (Mr. Tierney) had been in office, for he had not such a fortune as could support him independently out of it, and he would perhaps, be compelled to live upon bread and onions, when the worthy Baronet was faring sumptuously.’”—Now, really, I do not see anything very witty in this; and as to his reason for getting into office, I shall only say that, while a man's poverty may be a very good reason with him, it may be a very bad one with the public for letting him in. But, without pretending to say whether the report be correct, which states Mr. Tierney to have represented himself as liable “to be compelled to live upon bread and onions,” I will venture to assert most positively, that a man's being in that state is the best argument in the world for his not being chosen a member of that House, which has the power to dispose of the public money. If a man were to go to any nobleman of great estate, and say, “I am very poor, my Lord, and, therefore, I wish you would make me your steward,” the reasoning would be very good for the applicant; but, do you think, reader, that it would be conclusive with his Lordship? Yes, it would, in all probability, be quite conclusive, but the conclusion would be exactly the contrary way: “You are very poor, and, therefore, you shall not be my steward.”—It is a wonder, that Mr. Windham, in his speech, should have overlooked this part of the speech of his “Right Honourable friend,” as he appears to have done, when he was speaking of those persons of “real or fancied superiority of talents, but

“who had neither money nor land, and who condemned fortune for not seconding the views of nature, and placing them at the helm of affairs.”

LORD PORCHESTER is said to have censured sir Francis Burdett for having asserted, that the House of Commons had *acquitted* the Duke of York; but, if this assertion be *not true*, what was the assertion in the Duke's letter, which he wrote to the king, when he resigned his office, and which letter was laid before the House! He there stated, that the House had *acquitted* him. The authorities, on both sides, being so high, it might be deemed presumption in me to judge between them; but, surely, the “loyal” will excuse sir Francis Burdett for having conceived that the Duke of York spoke the truth. The fact is, that, upon this point, the “loyal” must be very much puzzled. They do not like to say that the Duke *was not acquitted*, for not to be acquitted is to be found guilty; and yet, it goes hard with the “loyal” to say, in so many words, that the House of Commons *did acquit* the Duke. But, after all, how stands the fact? Why shortly thus: that several propositions were made for expressing, in a greater or a less degree, censure on the conduct of the Duke of York; and, after *all* those propositions were *negatived*, the House resolved, *that no further proceeding in the case was necessary*. If this be not *acquittal*, what is? Acquittals are always in the *negative*. “Not guilty” is all that an *acquitting* jury says; but, in this case, there was the *affirmative* also; for, there was a majority upon Mr. Perceval's Resolution of complete *acquittal*. Pray, would not any public writer be exposed to the chance of having his ears clipped off, if he were to assert, that the House of Commons *did not acquit* the Duke of York? Lord Porchester is reported to have said, that the House did not *virtually* *acquit* the Duke. Why, then, they *virtually* found him *guilty*. But, should I dare say that? No, no. This *virtual* work is what we do not understand. We have been accustomed to hear the verdict of *guilty*, or *not guilty*; and do not comprehend any thing of your *virtual* finding *guilty*.

As to MR. CURWEN's motion itself, its fate is of little consequence. I do not believe that it will be adopted; but, it is valuable as having drawn forth a confession from a majority of the House itself, that *something* ought to be done. It will also be recollect, that, in the debate

upon Mr. Madocks's motion, he was told to wait and see what this measure would do; but, now, if the measure should not be adopted, what will then be said? God knows! In short, the enemies of reform have nothing left to say. They must "make a stand." That is the good phrase: "make a stand against popular encroachment." Mr. Madocks says, "I accuse two of the ministers of selling a seat in this House, and demand inquiry into the matter"; and the ministers answer, "it is time to make a stand against popular encroachment"; and the Opposition Benches echo: "make a stand!" Mr. Windham comes with his illustrative story: a man ought to be hanged who steals a goose from the common, but it may be meritorious to steal the common from the goose; that is to say, that the elector who sells his vote ought to be punished, but that the man who buys it, or who sells or buys a seat in parliament, ought to be subject to no punishment at all; nay, ought not to be censured, there being nothing immoral in his conduct; that the selling and buying of seats now makes a part of our glorious constitution, and that all those, who wish for such a change as would effectually prevent such traffic in future, are either knaves or dupes. —This is the ground, upon which the famous stand is to be made. Indeed, it is made. We all know one another's minds and resolutions. The stand-makers are resolved that seats shall continue to be bought and sold, and we, I trust, are equally resolved that they shall not. It is then, as they say, at the point of a game, "who shall?" and, if we persevere, we shall, in spite of all that can be opposed to us.

#### AUSTRIA, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL.

The former of these countries is now enjoying the fruits of the doctrines of those, who have so long preached up the necessity of "making a stand against popular encroachment." A pretty stand they have made at last; but, just such a stand as every man of sense expected to see them make. The Emperor Napoleon, who is Emperor not by "the grace of God," as he pretends, but by the folly, tyranny, and cowardice of princes, is now in possession of the capital of the Austrian dominions, whether he has gone without meeting, from the people, the smallest degree of resistance; and, I think, there can be little doubt, that we shall soon hear of his

having wholly subdued this nation of eighteen millions of people, who have an army far more numerous than his own, and of whose volunteers and militias and levies in mass we have heard such wonderful accounts.—With respect to the part that we have acted, or are acting, as to this new war between Austria and France, I think, there can be little doubt of our ministers having encouraged it by all the means in their power. It was such a clever thing, to set Austria on upon Bonaparte, in order to draw him off from Spain! The temptation was too strong to be resisted. It was not worth while to consider the final consequences. That was an object too distant to produce much impression upon the minds of such statesmen as ours. But, it appears very clear to me, that, when the war against Austria and her Archdukes is finished, the affairs of Spain and Portugal will not be long in settling.—At a meeting of the "PITT CLUB," which took place on the 27th of last month, and three hundred and twenty persons were present, Mr. Canning, secretary of state for foreign affairs, promulgated the sentiments of the ministry, relative to our allies, as they are oddly enough called.—But, before we come to these sentiments, let us make an observation or two upon this meeting, the persons present at which consisted almost entirely of placemen, pensioners, contractors, and loan-jobbers. Now, what right had these people to have a political meeting, without a license, any more than the persons who meet at the British Forum, or any where else. Much has been said, in St. Stephen's Chapel, disrespectful of the meetings in the several parts of the kingdom; but where has there been a meeting, except, perhaps, that at Ipswich, entitled to less respect than this meeting? The Lord Chancellor, it seems, was present, and, from the report of the proceedings published in the newspapers, it appears that he did not think it beneath the dignity of his station to thank the meeting for the honour they had done him in approving of his conduct along with that of his brother ministers. And yet, we hear it continually a subject of complaint, in the House of Commons, that certain members of that House make harangues at taverns, and are gratified at the applause of their hearers. But what a difference is there between the applause of a tax-devouring crew, like that now before us, and the assemblages, which the Crown and Anchor Tavern has lately witnessed within its walls!—Mr. Canning took

this occasion of stating to the nation the sentiments of the government with respect to Austria, Spain, and Portugal. With respect to the first, he told the prick-eared contractors and loan-jobbers, that he hoped the difficulties of Austria would be *but of short duration*; he gave them the glad intelligence that it was intended to afford the Emperor of Austria aid from our resources; he said that both the sovereign and the *people* had entered upon the struggle, prepared for great exertions; and he concluded by saying, that if Austria should fall, the struggle would not have been made in vain for Europe. Whereupon, it appears, there were "*loud and repeated applauses.*"— This secretary of state may, perhaps, have been able to discover some exertions on the part of the people of Austria; but we know that the Emperor Napoleon has reached Vienna; and, it would be quite curious to hear the reason, whereon he founds the opinion, that the fall of Austria will have contributed to the defence of Europe against that same Napoleon. It must be very consoling to the Emperor of Austria and his family to hear sentiments like these from an English minister; and, after hearing such sentiments, he must be a fool, indeed, not to be prepared to sacrifice himself and his people in the glorious cause.—For years and years past, have the tribe, assembled upon this occasion, been goading Austria on to war. Infinite are the means they have resorted to for this purpose. Often have they succeeded; and success after success has been attended with defeat after defeat on the part of Austria; till, at last, the total extinction of the power of the House of Lorrain promises to be the result of their efforts. And, it is at a moment when Napoleon is in possession of Vienna; when he is issuing his orders from the palaces of the fugitive sovereign; it is at such a moment, that the ministers of the king of England meet, and, amidst the applauses of their servile dependents, unfeelingly proclaim, that if Austria should fall, her struggle will not have been made in vain!

With respect to SPAIN, Mr. Canning told the crew, that he hoped that the *deliverance* of that country would be finally accomplished. The *toast*, which drew forth his observations with regard to Spain, was in the following words: “*Ferdinand VII., the legitimate king of Spain, and may the noble efforts of his subjects secure his rights and their own independence.*” From which we may clearly perceive the

sor of *deliverance*, contemplated by the ministers for Spain. The people are to fight for the *king’s rights*. We hear of no *rights of their own*, that they are to fight for. They are to have, it seems, *independence*; that is to say, they are to be independent of the family of Buonaparte. But what is this to the people of Spain? What care they, or what ought they to care, who is their master, unless they be convinced that they shall be more happy and free under one master than under the other?—As to the prospect of affairs in Spain, who can believe, that it is very fair, while we see, that nothing is done, even in the absence of the French armies? Why, if the spirit, in Spain, was such as we have been told it is, would not the present moment have been seized on to drive the French out of the country? Can any man believe, that, if this be not done *now*, it ever will be done? There has been time for French armies to march from the capital of Spain to the capital of Austria, and to fight many battles on the way, and yet there has not been time to make the remainder of the French quit Spain.—But, “stop,” some of the wise ones say, “till Lord Wellesley gets there.” Napoleon will, in all probability, be there nearly as soon as Lord Wellesley; and, whether he be or not, I should be glad to know what Lord Wellesley is likely to do in Spain. He will not have the Indian Princes to negotiate with, and to fight, in Spain. He will meet with no poor souls like the NABO VIZIER OF OUDE. It is said, in the news-papers, that he is merely going out to arrange matters, and is to leave his brother Henry there instead of Mr. Frere. I shall be sorry for this. I wish him to remain himself by all means; and then we shall have an opportunity of showing Napoleon what our Indian conqueror is made of. I should like to see the whole of the affairs in Spain and Portugal, left to the Wellesleys. I would have *nobody* interfere with them. I would leave them to do just what they pleased, or rather, what they were able. And, then, we should see what either they, or the cause, consisted of.— The great consideration, at present, however, is, that the remains of the French are still in Spain. One of two things must be: either they have a large army there, or a small one. If a large one, they will be able to keep their ground, till reinforcements arrive; and, if a small one, there can be no spirit of resistance in the Spanish people; the “universal Spanish nation,” cannot much dislike the

French. We are, the news-papers say, daily shipping off men to Sir Arthur Wellesley; but, when shall we send men equal in number to one of Napoleon's *Corps-d'-armée*? It is quite in vain to send off men, unless we were first *assured* of the cordial co-operation of the Spaniards themselves; and, have we any such assurance? Is there any man who really believes, that we shall meet with such co-operation? I do not, and, from what has passed, the evidence of which we have in Sir John Moore's letters, I am fully warranted in my disbelief.—To what purpose, then, put the English people to such immense expence? The taxes, caused by this war in Spain, will be severely felt; and, ought they to be imposed, until it be clearly ascertained, that since the retreat of Sir John Moore, the disposition of the people in Spain has changed?—I believe, that, without first making a complete revolution in Spain; without shaking society to pieces from the top to the bottom, there are not, in Spain, the materials to compose a force to resist the French. *We* have not power to send an army sufficient for the purpose; and, what must be the consequence, then, of our efforts.—MR. CANNING told the Contractors at the London Tavern, that, whether we succeeded or not; whatever the event of the struggle might be, our *generosity* would never be effaced from the minds of the *people* of Spain. The *people* of Spain! What part of our “generosity” do they taste of? If we were to send them food and clothing, they might be grateful; but, alas! what we expend does not reach even the ears of the people of Spain, much less their backs and bellies. How *grateful* they felt in Leon and Gallicia the remnant of our poor harrassed troops can tell. Sir John Moore's letters will tell. They have told; and yet, we are still to have dinned in our insulted ears, the *gratitude* and *zeal* of the “universal Spanish nation.”

As to PORTUGAL, it is manifest to every one, that any ground gained there, can be of no avail, unless the French be driven from Spain, of which Portugal is, by nature, a part. Therefore, it is quite useless to spend money and to shed blood in Portugal, unless there be a tolerably fair chance of finally succeeding in Spain; and, then, we come round again to the old point; to the old question, whether there be, or be not, in Spain itself, the means of raising a force sufficient to resist Napoleon? Of what use is it for Mr. Canning to tell his crew, that the House of

Braganza is *attached* to England, unless he could shew us, that that attachment was likely to be of some benefit to us? The attachment of the House of Braganza is of no more consequence than that of the House of Chicasaw, on the banks of the Ohio, unless the House of Braganza can assist in resisting Buonaparte. “*Trade* to the Brazils!” Why, it has *ruined thousands already*, and will ruin thousands more. The mad or deluded speculators, crammed five or six into a stinking room, and half-devoured with flies, are, at this moment, selling their goods under the prime cost. I speak from a knowledge of the facts; and I venture to say, that the trade to the Brazils has already produced a greater loss to England than the Brazils would sell for, if put up to auction. The fruit of the labour and the soil of England is now wasting in the shops, or *stores*, as they are called, of RIO JANEIRO, and that too, in quantities and to an amount almost incredible. This loss will be *felt*, though not seen, in every part of the nation; we shall have to bear our proportion of it; and, the mortification is, that we are told to look upon this loss as a benefit, for which we ought to give our money and risk our lives.—When the mighty *advantages* of a connection with the Brazils was first trumpeted forth, I did my best to stay the coming plague. One person, in particular, I did all in my power to dissuade from any adventure thither. A letter from him to a mutual friend has conveyed to me the proof of the correctness of all my predictions, down even to the minutest particulars. The picture he gives is truly distressing; but, it is not more so than it was painted by me before his departure. The public will recollect what pains I took, at the time, to stem the torrent of delusion. Those pains were taken in vain; and, I must say, that I do not feel much sorrow for the losses, or the sufferings, of those, whose thirst for gain closed their minds against the voice of reason. *The Brazils!* The Brazils were to build ships; to send butter and pork and hoops and staves and timber to the West Indies; and, what was still better, they were to send us *sugar* and *coffee*, as if the West Indians had not an ounce of either to spare! Was there ever any thing so mad as this? And yet, upon grounds like these; for *benefits* like these, is this nation put to the expence of maintaining an expensive embassy in the Brazils, and, also a *fleet* and an *army*. The whole of the immense expence, attending this connection, is, in my view of things,

so much of dead loss to the nation. We, in England, work to raise taxes to pay to the people of the Brazils for the food, which they supply to our sailors and soldiers, who are sent and stationed there for the protection of the government of the Prince Regent. This is the short view of the matter; but, this is a view of it which the herd of contractors and jobbers and placemen and pensioners did not want to take. They gain by the connection with the Brazils; but we lose. They gain by whatever augments the public expenditure; by whatever extends the sphere of office and of borough influence; and, therefore, it was quite natural in them to applaud the sentiments, which have been published as those of the ministry, delivered by the Secretary of State, at a meeting by far the least reputable, in almost any point of view, of any that has taken place in the kingdom, within the last three months, with the sole exception of that at Ipswich, the head quarters of the German Baron.

#### ANOTHER DECISION

#### OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

On Tuesday last, the 30th of May, Sir JOHN NEWPORT made a statement as follows:—“He rose to call the attention of “the House to an appointment which had “been made in defiance of the express “words of the Act of the 46th year of the “King, and of every principle upon which “promotions and rewards should be con-“ferred. By the Act to which he had “alluded, any officer of the customs or “Excise, who should, after the passing of “that Act, *take or accept of any fee, gra-“tuity or presents*, from the distillers whom “they visited in the course of their duty, “should be thereby incapacitated from “holding any office, civil or military. “Notwithstanding the express words of “this Act, a MR. BEAUCHAMP HILL, who “had confessed before Commissioners of “Enquiry, that he had regularly received “20*l.* per week from two distillers who “were in his district, was not only *not dis-“missed*, but was *promoted* from the situation “of Surveyor to be an Inspector General, “which was a promotion in that very de-“partment in which the frauds had been “committed. It was in September 1806, “that he had confessed himself guilty “of the fraud, and on the 8th of March “1808 he received his promotion. He “thought it would be useless to endea-“vour to guess at what sort of defence “could be set up, and concluded by mov-

“ing a resolution, stating the words of the “Act of the 46th of his Majesty, the confes-“sion of Mr. Hill that he had acted contrary “to it, and his subsequent promotion.”

Well, what was now done? What did the House do? Why, the motion was opposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Perceval) and by Mr. Croker and by the Son of Lord Melville. But, what did the House; what did *the House of Commons* do? Why they voted (77 against 50) that *the motion should not be adopted*.

Now, reader, remember, that, in the year 1802, one PHILIP HAMLIN, a Tinman of Plymouth, having written a letter to Mr. Addington, offering the said Addington 2,000*l.* to give him a place in the Custom House, he was, by this very Mr. Perceval, who was then Attorney General, prosecuted criminally for the said offence; that, upon the man's making affidavit of the innocence of his intention, and of the ruin that punishment would bring upon his family, the said Mr. Perceval demanded judgment upon him in the name of PUBLIC JUSTICE; that the Judge, in passing sentence, dwelt much upon the moral as well as political evils, to which such practices must tend; and finally, that the said Philip Hamlin was sentenced to pay *a fine of a hundred pounds to the king, and to be imprisoned for three Kalendar months*.

Mr. Barham (in the debate upon the above motion) said “there was one argument which ought to make the House cautious in what way they dealt with this motion. It had been publicly and generally asserted, that many persons sat in that House by improper means. The public had taken the alarm; and it had been found in support of that alarm, and those assertions, that a Cabinet Minister had actually been concerned in bartering for a seat in that House, and was defended for such an act. It was by the motion that moment under consideration, and the arguments urged in support of it, further asserted that corruptions prevailed in a most extensive degree over the whole revenue of Ireland. If something were not done to rectify these corruptions and abuses—if no step were taken towards removing them, he dreaded to think, what the public opinion of that House must very soon be.”

#### AMERICAN STATES.

Did I not, the moment there arose a dispute with America; nay, long before,

suggest the propriety of committing our affairs, in that country, to other hands? I was regarded as spiteful and malicious; but, I think, that it will now be allowed, that it would have been prudent to follow my advice; for the Secretary of State has openly and explicitly declared, in the House of Commons, that "the proceedings "of our minister in America have been "in direct contradiction to his instructions."

The interesting point for the people of this country now is, whether that minister, when he comes home, *will have a great pension settled upon him for life?* This is the question. The connection with America, it has now been *proved*, we do not want. It is of no consequence to us, while (as an article in another part of this sheet will show) they are beggars without it; but, it is of great consequence to us to know, whether this same minister is to be fastened upon us and our children to the tune of *two or three thousand pounds a year.*

#### THE COURT MARTIAL.

The *Government* (for, it is hard to conceive that any body can have done it without its consent) appears to have sanctioned the publication of certain documents, relative to a *Court-Martial*, at which in 1792, I endeavoured to bring certain persons to punishment.—Had the whole of the Papers been published, without any misrepresentation, I never should have noticed the thing at all; but, have left the documents to speak for themselves.—In my next double number, however, I shall, as the thing now stands, give a full account of the matter; and I venture to say, that, when I have so done, there is not a single man, who shall read that account, who will think, that (the circumstances of my situation considered) what I then attempted to do was more meritorious than any of the many important things, which a change of circumstances has enabled me to accomplish.—The friends of corruption are aware of my weight in the great question of *Parliamentary Reform*; and, next to the destroying of my credit with the public, there is nothing they so much desire as to engage me in a *personal warfare*, which I am resolved they shall not do. I will waste upon them not one moment of that time, which is due to the public. I deny most positively every one of their insinuations, and I defy them to make good against me any charge of having acted, at any time of my life, dishonestly or dishonourably. The vile insinuations of the anonymous wretches,

whom the patrons of corruption suborn to calumniate me, I not only despise, but I despise all those, who affect to lend an ear to them; and, in this feeling, I have, in the increasing circulation of my writings, the best possible proof, that I have the public with me.—This attempt, on the part of the friends of corruption, is a desperate one. They must feel themselves hard driven, when they have recourse to such means. They are stung to madness at my success, which, they plainly see, must contribute largely towards their overthrow. They will, in the end, lose by their efforts; but, theirs is a life of expedients; the evil hour is what they wish to get rid of; and of that hour they will not get rid.

*Botley, 1st June, 1809.*

#### COBBETT'S COMPLETE COLLECTION OF State Trials:

To be completed in Thirty-Six Monthly Parts, forming Twelve large Volumes in Royal Octavo.

The SIXTH PART of the above Work was published on Thursday the 1st instant. One Part will appear, with the greatest regularity, on the first of each succeeding Month. Those Subscribers who have expressed their intention of taking the Work in Quarterly Volumes, are respectfully informed that the Second Volume is now ready for delivery.

#### COBBETT'S Parliamentary Debates:

The TWELFTH VOLUME of the above Work will be ready for delivery on the first of July. All communications, if sent to the Publisher's in due time, shall be carefully attended to.

#### AMERICAN STATES.

*I cannot help recording the following articles, relative to the Restoration of Intercourse with England.*

*New York, April 21.*

Notice.—The Federal Republican Committee, of the city of New York, recommend to all ship owners and masters of vessels to display their colours on Monday next, in honour of the triumph of Federal Policy, in the restoration of intercourse between the United States and Great Britain.—The persons having charge of the bells in the different churches, are re-

quested to cause them to be rung from twelve to one o'clock in the same day—And it is ordered that a Committee wait on the Commandant of Artillery, and request that he will cause a Federal Salute to be fired at sun-rise, noon, and sun-set, on the same glorious occasion.

*Committee-Room, Saturday Evening, April 22.*

### GENERAL MEETING.

*Triumph of Federal Policy—No Embargo.—No French party—A return of Peace, Prosperity and Commerce.*

All true friends of their country—all who are disciples of Washington, and disposed to support the Federal Ticket at the ensuing election, are requested to meet this day, at twelve o'clock, at the Circus, to consider the present state of our national affairs, and to support that system of Federal Politics which has at last compelled the administration to abandon a fruitless and self-destructive Embargo, and take the first step towards a settlement of our affairs with Great Britain, by accepting terms offered sixteen months ago; thus putting our differences with that nation in a train of being fairly and honourably adjusted, instead of French threats and confiscations abroad, and French influence at home.

*April 24.*

Yesterday, agreeably to notice, our citizens evinced public testimonies of their joy on the prospect of a restoration of commercial intercourse with England. The day was ushered in by a grand Federal Salute, which was repeated at noon, and at sun-set. The shipping in harbour were decorated with their flags at mast-head during the day. The American EAGLE, roused from despondency, once more soared among the stars, floating with fond complacency over resuscitated commerce, and expanding his pinions in triumph at her restoration. The ringing of bells and the thunder of cannon spoke the feelings of freedom, and proclaimed to the skies, the virtuous enthusiasm of political friendship. Mutual felicitations were exchanged among our patriotic citizens, and the joys of the heart lighted up a smile on every countenance.—At twelve o'clock a very numerous and respectable assembly of Federal Republicans met at the Circus. So large and so animated an assemblage of Electors was never before witnessed in this country. Though the place will contain upwards of four thousand, it could not admit the whole who attended.—The city, in the evening, was splendidly and fancifully illu-

minated:—while the chiming of the bells and sounds of joy in the streets which swelled on the breath of eve, filled every virtuous bosom with sensations of delight.—What are the reflections which present themselves to the mind from a survey and recapitulation of this scene?—A natural association of ideas pourtray a people, who, after having long groaned under despotic restrictions, severe bondage, and oppressive laws, are suddenly emancipated by the firmness and virtue of inflexible patriots. To them do we owe these testimonies of gratitude and joy. And who are they? The Federalists of the Eastern States, who made a noble stand against unconstitutional and unjust oppression, and drove its authors from the iniquitous ground they had taken.

### PROCEEDINGS

*In COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &c. relative to the recent Inquiry in the House of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK. (Continued from p. 825.)*

### TOWN OF BLACKBURN.

An ADDRESS of Thanks from the Inhabitants of the Town and Neighbourhood of Blackburn, in the County of Lancaster, to G. L. Wardle, Esq. M. P. for his late Proceedings in the hon. House of Commons.

Sir;

The wisdom of ages has been employed in forming and arranging the principles of the British Constitution. By the provision of formidable checks to the progress of corruption, those principles are intended to operate in preserving at once the liberty of the subject and the stability of the throne. But individual interests and designs are too often in opposition to their legitimate influence; and it requires a rare combination of talents and virtues to give to that influence, energy and direction. In you, sir, we contemplate such a combination; and are desirous of uniting our testimony with the voice of the kingdom in the public and cordial expression of our thanks and congratulations.—While we regret and reprobate those abuses of power and patronage which have for a series of years so notoriously existed in the appointments to military offices, we sincerely rejoice in the disclosure of those improper transactions, during a recent Inquiry at the Bar of the House of Commons. For that Inquiry, and all its important consequences, we are, sir, indebted to you; and we gratefully

acknowledge and highly applaud the independence and patriotism with which your investigations were commenced and concluded.—We trust that the success which has rewarded your exertions, and the spirit of constitutional inquiry which now pervades the nation, will be felt by you as powerful motives to an uniform and courageous resistance of corruption, with whatever authority and splendour it may be invested. Deeply convinced of the necessity of an immediate and general Reform of all the Abuses of the Executive Government, we behold with lively interest the results of other inquiries, and the proceedings of those best friends to the permanent welfare of the empire, with whom you are associated, and under whose auspices we look forward to a purer administration of affairs.—We cannot, sir, close our congratulations, without the further expression of our Thanks to those noble and honourable members, by whom you were supported in your late proceedings. And we would particularly express our approbation of the conduct of the representatives of the neighbouring borough of Preston (Lord Stanley and Mr. Horrocks), because they appear to have been the only members in the county of Lancaster whose votes accorded with the evidence of facts and the opinions of the nation.—With the sincerest wishes that you may enjoy a long protracted life of usefulness and honour, we subscribe ourselves,

Sir,  
Yours, &c.

---

#### COUNTY OF WILTS.

At a Meeting of the Freeholders, Landholders, and other Inhabitants of the County of Wilts, convened by the High Sheriff, and held at the Council Chamber, in the City of New Sarum, on Wednesday, May 17, 1809;—Sir CHARLES WARRE MALET, in the Chair,—It was Resolved,

That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq., for having instituted the recent Inquiry in the House of Commons, relative to the conduct of H. R. H. the Duke of York, as Commander-in-Chief; for having, unconnected with, and unsupported by, any party or faction, prosecuted that laudable undertaking with unexampled magnanimity, talent, zeal, temper, and perseverance, and especially for having had the resolution to discharge his duty, in defiance of the threats and prejudices excited against him by the King's ministers, and by many of the leaders of the opposite party.

That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Sir F. Burdett, bart., who seconded Mr. Wardle's motion, and also to Lord Visc. Folkestone, for the active and able assistance he afforded to Mr. Wardle during the whole of the Inquiry.

That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to Lords Visc. Milton and Althorpe, Lord Stanley, the hon. T. Brand, the hon. W. H. Lyttleton, Sir S. Romilly, knt., Major-General Ferguson, S. Whitbread, T. Curwen, T. W. Coke, H. Martin, T. Calcraft, and C. W. Wynne, esqrs., who, during such inquiry, stood forward the advocates of impartial justice, and also to the whole of the Minority of 125, who divided in favour of Mr. Wardle's motion, amongst whom we, as Wiltshire Men, observe with pleasure the name of that venerable and truly independent senator, William Hussey, esq., who, for nine successive parliaments, has represented the city of New Sarum with ability and perseverance, and with undeviating integrity and independence; of Thomas Goddard, esq., member for Cricklade, and of Benjamin Walsh, esq., member for Wootton-Basset, in this county; while we observe, with indignation and regret, that the name of neither of the Members for this county does appear in that honourable list. And we also lament, that with the exception of Lord Folkestone, William Hussey, Thomas Goddard, and Benjamin Walsh, esqrs., we do not recognize in that list the name of any of the 34 Members who are sent to Parliament by the various Boroughs in this county.

That in adverting to the causes of the disgraceful acts revealed and demonstrated during this Inquiry, this Meeting cannot help observing, that in the act of parliament, commonly called the Act of Settlement, in virtue of which Act only His Majesty's family were raised to the throne of this kingdom, it is declared, "That no person who has an Office or Place of Profit under the King, or receives a Pension from the Crown, shall be capable of serving as a Member of the House of Commons." But that, notwithstanding the wise precautions of this Act, which is one of our great constitutional laws, and which, as its preamble expresses, was made for the further limitation of the Crown, and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, it appears from a Report laid before the House of Commons, in the month of June last, in consequence of a Motion made by lord Cochrane, that there are in that House

18 Placemen and Pensioners, who, though part of what they receive was not stated, are in the said Report stated to receive £178,994 a year, out of the taxes paid by the people, and out of that money, to watch over the expenditure of which they themselves are appointed.

That we observe the names of all those Placemen and Pensioners voting against Mr. Wardle's Motion.

That in the Act called the Bill of Rights, it is declared, "That the Election of Members of Parliament ought to be free;" and in the same Act it is declared, "That the violating the freedom of Election of Members to serve in Parliament, was one of the crimes of King James II. and one of the grounds upon which he was driven from the throne of this kingdom." But that, notwithstanding that law, this Meeting have observed, that on the 11th instant, Mr. Madocks did, in the House of Commons, distinctly charge Mr. Perceval and lord Castlereagh with having actually sold a seat in Parliament to Mr. Dick, and with having endeavoured to prevail upon the said Mr. Dick to vote against Mr. Wardle in the case of the Duke of York; and that Mr. Madocks having made a motion for an inquiry into the said transactions, the House, by a very large majority, decided that there should be no such inquiry.

That from these facts, as well as numerous others, notorious to us, and to the whole nation, this Meeting have a firm conviction, that it is in the House of Commons, as at present constituted, that exists the great and efficient cause of all such scandalous abuses, in various departments of the State, as have, in other countries, alienated the subject from the Sovereign, and eventually produced the downfall of the state.

That therefore this Meeting, anxious alike for the preservation of his Majesty's throne and legitimate authority, and for the restoration of the rights and liberties bequeathed them by the wisdom, the fortitude, and the valour of their forefathers, hold it a duty which they owe to their Sovereign and his successors, to themselves and to their children, and to the safety, happiness, and renown of their country, to declare their decided opinion and conviction, that no change for the better can be reasonably expected, without such a Reform in the Commons' House of Parliament, as shall make that House in reality, as well as in name, the Representatives of the People, and not the instru-

ments in the hands of a Minister. And we further declare, that from the proof we have always had of his Majesty's love for his people, we have full confidence in his royal support and protection, in our constitutional efforts, against a faction, not less hostile to the true dignity and just prerogatives of his Majesty's throne, than they are to the interest and feelings of his faithful, suffering, and insulted people.

That HENRY PENRUDDOCK WYNDHAM and RICHARD LONG, esqrs., the Representatives of this County, have, by their late conduct in Parliament, proved themselves undeserving the confidence of their constituents, and of the future support of this county.

Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the High Sheriff for calling the same, and for his impartial conduct in the Chair.

#### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

##### AMERICA.—*Orders in Council.*

At the Court of the Queen's Palace, the 24th of May, 1809.—Present—The King's most excellent Majesty in Council :

Whereas his Majesty was pleased, by his Order in Council of the 26th of April last, to declare certain ports and places of the countries which have been lately styled the kingdom of Holland, to be subject to the restrictions incident to a strict and rigorous blockade, as continued from his Majesty's former Order of the 11th Nov. 1807 ; and whereas advices have been received of a certain Provisional Agreement entered into by his Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in America, with the Government of the United States, whereby it is understood that his Majesty's Orders in Council of the 7th Jan. and of the 11th Nov. 1807, shall be withdrawn so far as respects the United States, on the 10th of June next.

And whereas, although the said Provisional Agreement is not such as was authorised by his Majesty's Instructions, or such as his Majesty can approve, it may already have happened, or may happen, that persons being citizens of the said United States may be led by a reliance on the said Provisional Agreement, to engage in trade with and to the said ports and places of Holland, contrary to, and in violation of the restrictions imposed by the said Orders of the 7th Jan. and of the 11th Nov. 1807, as altered by the Order of the 26th April last; his Majesty, in order to prevent any inconveniences that may ensue from the circumstance above

recited, is pleased, by and with the advice of his Privy Council, to order, and it is hereby ordered, That the said several Orders shall be suspended, so far as is necessary for the protection of vessels of the said United States, so sailing under the faith of the said Provisional Agreement, viz. That after the 9th day of June next, no vessel of the United States, which shall have cleared out between the 19th of April last, and the 20th of July ensuing, for any of the ports of Holland aforesaid from any port of the United States, shall be molested or interrupted in her voyage by the Commanders of his Majesty's ships or privateers.

And it is further ordered, that no vessels of the United States, which shall have cleared out from any port of America previous to the 20th of July next, for any other permitted port, and shall, during her voyage, have changed her destination, in consequence of information of the said Provisional Agreement, and shall be proceeding to any of the ports of Holland aforesaid, shall be molested or interrupted by the Commanders of any of his Majesty's ships or privateers, unless such vessel shall have been informed of this Order on her voyage, and shall have been warned not to proceed to any of the ports of Holland aforesaid, and shall, notwithstanding such warning, be found attempting to proceed to any such port.

And it is further ordered, that after the said 9th day of June next, no vessel of the said United States which shall have cleared out, or be destined to any of the ports of Holland from any other port or place not subject to the restrictions of the said Order of the 26th of April last, after notice of such Provisional Agreement as aforesaid, shall be molested or interrupted in her voyage by the Commanders of his Majesty's ships or privateers, provided such vessel shall have so cleared out previous to actual notice of this Order at such place of clearance, or in default of proof of actual notice previous to the like periods of time after the date of this Order, as are fixed for constructive notice of his Majesty's Order of the 11th of Nov. 1807, by the Orders of the 25th Nov. 1807, and of the 18th of May, 1808, at certain places and latitudes therein mentioned, unless such vessel shall have been informed of this Order on her voyage, and warned by any of his Majesty's ships or privateers not to proceed to any port of Holland, and shall, notwithstanding such warning, attempt to proceed to any such port.

And his Majesty is pleased further to order, and it is hereby ordered, That the said several Orders of the 7th of Jan. and 11th of Nov. 1807, as altered by the said Order of the 26th of April last, shall also be suspended, so far as is necessary for the protection of vessels of the said United States which shall clear out, to any ports not declared to be under the restriction of blockade from any port of Holland between the 9th day of June and the 1st day of July next, provided always, that nothing that is contained in the present Order shall extend, or be construed to extend, to protect any vessels or their cargoes, that may be liable to condemnation or detention for any other cause than the violation of the aforesaid Orders of the 7th of Jan. and the 11th of Nov. 1807, as altered by the said Order of the 26th of April last.

Provided also, that nothing in this Order contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, to protect any vessel which shall attempt to enter any port actually blockaded by any of his Majesty's ships of war.

And the right hon. the Lords Commissioners of his Majesty's Treasury, his Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, and the Judge of the High Court of Admiralty, and the Judges of the Court of Vice-Admiralty, are to give the necessary directions herein as to them may respectfully appertain.

STEPHEN COTTRELL.

---

FRENCH ARMY IN AUSTRIA.—*First Bulletin, (concluded from p. 832.)*

The Austrian cavalry, strong and numerous, attempted to cover the retreat of their infantry, but they were attacked by the division of St. Sulpice on the right, and by the division of Nansoutz on the left, and the enemy's line of hussars and cuirassiers routed, more than 300 Austrian cuirassiers were made prisoners. As the night was commencing, our cuirassiers continued their march to Ratisbon. The division of Nansoutz met with a column of the enemy, which was escaping, and attacked it, and compelled it to surrender; it consisted of three Hungarian battalions of 1,500 men.—The division of St. Sulpice charged another division of the enemy, where the archduke Charles narrowly escaped being taken. He was indebted for his safety to the fleetness of his horse. This column was also broken and taken. Darkness at length compelled our

troops to halt. In this battle of Echmuhl, not above half of the French troops were engaged. The enemy, closely pressed, continued to desile the whole of the night in small divisions, and in great confusion. All their wounded, the greater part of their artillery, 15 standards, and 20,000 prisoners, fell into our hands.

*Battle of Ratisbon, and taking of that place.*

On the 23rd, at day break, the army advanced upon Ratisbon; the advanced guard, formed by the division of Gudin, and by the cuirassiers of Nansoutz and St. Sulpice, and they very soon came in sight of the enemy's cavalry, which attempted to cover the city. Three successive charges took place, all of which were to our advantage. Eight thousand of their troops having been cut to pieces, the enemy precipitately repassed the Danube. During these proceedings, our light infantry tried to get possession of the city. By a most unaccountable disposition of his force, the Austrian general sacrificed six regiments there without any reason. The city is surrounded with a bad wall, a bad ditch, and a bad counterscarp. The artillery having arrived, the city was battered with some twelve pounders. It was recollectcd that there was one part of the fortifications where, by means of a ladder, it was possible to descend into the ditch, and to pass on the other side through a breach in the wall. The duke of Montebello caused a battalion to pass through this opening: they gained a postern, and introduced themselves into the city. All those who made resistance were cut to pieces: the number of prisoners exceed 8,000. In consequence of these unskilful dispositions, the enemy had not time to destroy the bridge, and the French passed pell-mell with them to the left bank. This unfortunate city, which they were barbarous enough to defend, has suffered considerably. A part of it was on fire during the night, but by the efforts of general Moraud, and his division, it was extinguished. Thus, at the battle of Abensberg, the Emperor beat separately the two corps of the archduke Louis and general Keller; at the battle of Landshut, he took the centre of their communications, and the general dépôt of their magazines and artillery; finally, at the battle of Eckmuhl, the four corps of Hohenzollern, Rosenberg, Kollowrath, and Lichtenstein, were defeated. The corps of general Bellegarde arrived the day after the battle; they could only be witnesses of the taking of Ratisbon, and then fled into Bohemia.

In all these battles our loss amounted to 1,200 killed and 4,000 wounded!!!—[Then follows a list of the French officers killed and wounded, and very high eulogiums upon the different French generals.]—Of 222,000 of which the Austrian army was composed, all have been engaged except 20,000 men, commanded by general Bellegarde. On the other hand, near one half of the French army has not fired a shot. The enemy, astonished by rapid movements, which were out of their calculation, were in a moment deprived of their foolish hopes, and precipitated from a delirium of presumption to a despondency approaching to despair.

*Second Bulletin, dated Muhldorf, April 27.*

On the 22d, the day after the battle of Landshut, the Emperor left that city for Ratisbon, and fought the battle of Echmuhl. At the same time he sent the duke of Istria with the Bavarian division under general Wrede, and Moltor's division, to proceed to the Inn, and pursue the two corps of the Austrian army beaten at Abensberg and Landshut.—The duke of Istria arrived successively at Wilsburg and Neumark, found there upwards of 400 carriages, caissons and equipages, and took from 15 to 1800 prisoners in his march.—The Austrian corps found beyond Neumark, a corps of reserve which had arrived upon the Inn. They rallied, and on the 25th gave battle at Neumark, where the Bavarians, notwithstanding their extreme inferiority, preserved their positions.—On the 24th the Emperor had sent the corps of the duke of Rivoli from Ratisbon to Straubing, and from thence to Passau, where he arrived on the 26th. The duke made the battalion of the Po pass the Inn—it made 300 prisoners, removed the blockade of the citadel, and occupied Scharding.—On the 25th the duke of Montebello had orders to march with his corps from Ratisbon to Muhldorf. On the 27th he passed the Inn and proceeded to the Salza.—To-day, the 27th, the Emperor has his head-quarters at Muhldorf.—The Austrian division, commanded by general Jellachich, which occupied Munich, is pursued by the corps of the duke of Dantzig.—The king of Bavaria has shewn himself at Munich. He afterwards returned to Augsburg, where he will remain some days, intending not to fix his residence at Munich till Bavaria shall be entirely delivered from the enemy.—On the side of Ratisbon the duke of Auerstadt is gone in pursuit of prince

Charles, who cut off from his communication with the Inn and Vienna, has no other resource than that of retiring into the mountains of Bohemia, by Waldmünchen and Cham.—With respect to the emperor of Austria, he appears to have been before Passau, in order to besiege that place with three battalions of the Landwerk.—All Bavaria and the Palatinate are delivered from the presence of the enemy.—At Ratisbon, the Emperor passed several corps in review, and caused the bravest soldiers to be presented to him, to whom he gave distinctions and pensions, and the bravest officers, to whom he gave baronies and lands.—Hitherto the Emperor has carried on the war almost without equipage and guards; and one has remarked, that in the absence of his guards, he had always about him the allied Bavarian and Würtemberg troops; wishing thereby to give them a particular proof of confidence.—A report has been circulated that the Emperor has had his leg broken. The fact is, that a spent ball grazed the heel of his boot, but did not touch the skin. Never was his majesty in better health, though in the midst of the greatest fatigue.—It has been remarked as a singular fact, that one of the first Austrian officers made prisoners in this war, was the aide de camp of prince Charles, sent to M. Otto with the famous letter, purporting that the French army must retire.—The inhabitants of Ratisbon having behaved very well, and evinced that patriotic and confederated spirit which we have a right to expect from them, his majesty has ordered that the damages done shall be repaired at his expence, and particularly the rebuilding of the houses burnt, the expence of which will be several millions.—All the sovereigns and territories of the Confederacy evince the most patriotic spirit. When the Austrian minister at Dresden delivered the Declaration of his court to the king of Saxony, the latter could not contain his indignation—“ You wish for war, and “ against whom? You attack and you in- “ veigh against a man, who three years “ ago, master of your destiny, restored “ your states to you. The proposals made “ to me afflict me; my engagements are “ known to all Europe; no prince of the “ Confederacy will detach himself from “ them.”—The grand duke of Wurtz-

burg, the emperor of Austria's brother, has shewn the same sentiments, and has declared that if the Austrians advanced to his territories, he should retire, if necessary, across the Rhine—so well are the insanity and the invectives of Vienna appreciated! The regiments of the petty princes, all the allied troops are eager to march against the enemy.—A notable circumstance, which posterity will remark as a fresh proof of the signal bad faith of Austria, is, that on the day she wrote the annexed letter to the king of Bavaria, she published, in the Tyrol, the proclamation signed by general Jellachich. On the same day she proposed to the king to be neutral, and invited his subjects to rise. How can we reconcile this contradiction, or rather how justify this infamy?

[To the Bulletins are annexed a Proclamation from the Austrian general Jellachich, inviting the Tyrolese to throw off the Bavarian yoke, and to resume their allegiance to their old master; and a letter from the archduke Charles to the king of Bavaria, soliciting his co-operation in a war undertaken for the general deliverance of Germany.]

#### *Proclamation.*

Soldiers, you have justified my expectations. You have made up for numbers by your bravery. You have gloriously marked the difference that exists between the soldiers of Caesar and the armed cohorts of Xerxes.—In a few days we have triumphed in the three battles of Tann, Abensberg, and Echmühl, and in the actions of Peising, Landshut, and Ratisbon. One hundred pieces of cannon, 40 standards, 50,000 prisoners, 3,000 waggon, full of baggage, all the chests of the regiments—Such is the result of the rapidity of your march and your courage.—The enemy, besotted by a perjured cabinet, seemed no longer to preserve any recollection of us.—They have been promptly awaked—You have appeared to them more terrible than ever. Lately they crossed the Inn, and invaded the territory of our allies. Lately they presumed to carry the war into the heart of our country. Now, defeated and dismayed, they fly in disorder. Already my advanced-guard has passed the Inn—before a month is elapsed we shall be at Vienna.—From our Head-quarters, Ratisbon, 24th April.—(Signed) NAPOLEON.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 23.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 10, 1809.

[Price 1s.

On the 12th of May, 1809, MR. MADOCKS made, in the House of Commons, a charge in substance as follows: "I affirm, then, that MR. DICK purchased a seat in the House of Commons for the borough of Cashel, through the agency of the HONOURABLE HENRY WELLESLEY, who acted for, and on behalf of the Treasury: that, upon a *recent question*, of the last importance, when MR. DICK had determined to vote according to his conscience, the noble Lord, CASTLEREAGH, did intimate to that gentleman the necessity of either his voting with the government, or resigning his seat in that House; and that MR. DICK, sooner than vote against principle, did make choice of the latter alternative, and vacate his seat accordingly. To this transaction I charge the Right Hon. Gentleman, MR. PERCEVAL, as being privy and having connived at it. This I will engage to prove by witnesses at your bar, if the House will give me leave to call them."—At the end of a long Debate upon this subject, the question was taken upon a motion for *an Inquiry* into the matter; that there appears from the reports of the proceedings, published in the papers, to have been 395 Members present, that, out of 395, only 85 voted for the motion, which, of course, was lost, there being 310 out of the 395, who voted *against the motion for Inquiry*.—In the year 1802, this same MR. PERCEVAL, being then Attorney General, prosecuted PHILIP HAMLIN, a Tinman of Plymouth, for having committed the crime of offering Mr. ADDINGTON £2,000, to give him a place in the Custom House; upon this occasion, MR. PERCEVAL demanded judgment upon the said Hamlin, for the sake of PUBLIC JUSTICE; and the Judge, after expatiating upon the "incalculable mischief," to which such crimes must naturally lead, sentenced the said Hamlin to pay a fine of *a hundred pounds to the king, and to be imprisoned for three Calendar months*.—N. B. This is the same MR. Perceval, who, in 1807, set up the Godly cry of "No Popery."

865]—

[SCG

## PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

BELONGING to this subject, nothing more important has taken place, than the Speech, made by the SPEAKER of the House of Commons, on Thursday, the 1st of this month. —This Speech, of which I am fully warranted in saying, that I have a *correct report*, I shall here insert, at full length; and, afterwards offer, in the shape of a Letter, such observations upon it, as appear to me necessary, and likely to be useful.—This Speech was made in a Committee of the whole House upon MR. CURWEN's *Reform bill*; and, I beg the reader, as he proceeds in the perusal, to contrast the doctrines and the sentiments, which the Speaker has now thought proper to express, with the doctrines and the sentiments proclaimed, *by both sides of the House*, upon MR. MADOCKS's motion of the 12th of May; and to apply these doctrines and sentiments to the notorious cases of CASTLEREAGH, HENRY WELLESLEY, and PERCEVAL, and to what was advanced, upon MR. MADOCKS's motion, by those more immediately connected with the borough-mongers, that is to say, those who sell and deal in Seats in Parliament.

## SPEECH

OF THE RIGHT HON. THE SPEAKER:

Thursday the 1st of June, 1809.

MR. WHARTON,

BEFORE you proceed to put the Question of Reading this Bill a first time, I wish to offer myself to your notice:

And although I am at all times unwilling to request the attention of the Committee of this House, thinking that I should render them no service by mixing in their general Debates, and feeling also the inconvenience of being precluded afterwards by my other duties in this House from explaining or defending my opinions in any subsequent stage of discussion; nevertheless there are some subjects of a paramount importance, upon which I do conceive that I have a personal duty imposed upon me (and perhaps the House may think in some degree an official duty) to deliver the sentiments which I entertain:—And such is the present.

The Question now before us, is no less than this—Whether *Seats in this House shall be henceforth publicly saleable?*—A proposition, at the sound of which, our Ancestors would have started with indignation; but a practice, which in these days and within these walls, in utter oblivion of every former maxim and feeling of Parliament, has been avowed and justified.

We are now, however, come to a pass from which we have no retreat. Upon this Question we must decide, Aye or No. To do nothing is to do every thing. If we forbear to reprobate this traffic, we give it legality and sanction. And unless we now proceed to brand and stigmatize it by a prohibitory Law, I can firmly persuaded that even before the short remnant of this Session is concluded, we shall see that Seats in this House are advertised for

sale by Public Auction: And we shall have brought a greater scandal upon Parliament and the Nation, than this country has ever known since Parliaments have had an existence.

According to the course which these Debates have taken, three distinct points have been put in issue: First, Whether the Traffic be a Political Evil; in the next place, Whether it be any Parliamentary Offence; and lastly, Whether there is any safe and practicable Remedy by which this mischief can be put down for the time to come.

Sir; Into the first point, Whether this be a Political Evil, I do not mean to enter at any length; nor is it necessary to my purpose.

That the Influence of Property in maintaining Civil Order is of the highest importance, no man living can doubt: it is the firmest cement to all the relations of social life, it gives Stability to the State, and Prosperity to the Empire. That the Possessions of Property may, and must, and ought to have a predominating Influence in the Election of Members to serve in this House, I think is equally clear. But, that, abandoning all their legitimate rights of Influence, and laying aside all the virtuous and generous Motives of Friendship, Affection, and the fair preference of Talents and Integrity to fill places of such high Public Trust, they should go to a shameless and open market; that they should sell the Attachment of their Friends, Neighbours, and Dependents, for dry and sordid gain; and sell it to other Strangers, of whose Qualities they can have no other Estimate than the Weight of their Purses; this does indeed appear to me to be a great Political Evil, and a great Public Grievance. It degrades and debases the habits of the higher ranks of life, who confess their own sense of the nature of these transactions, by the concealment with which they seek to cover them: It taints also and contaminates the general Character of Parliament: and it furnishes the most formidable weapons to those who are professing, and I am willing to believe sincerely professing, to reform, but as I fear, are, in truth and in fact, by the tendency of their endeavours, labouring to *subvert* the entire System of our Parliamentary Representation.

With respect, Sir, to the next Question, whether these practices are any Parliamentary Offence. That it is a high Parliamentary Offence, every page of our History, Statutes, and Journals, appears to me to bear evidence.

It is essential to the very idea of Elections that they should be free. Such is the antient language of the Statute of Westminster in the reign of Edward the First, speaking of Elections in general; such also is the modern language of the Bill of Rights, with reference specifically to the Election of Members to serve in Parliament; and we have a memorable instance in the year immediately following the Revolution of the sense in which this fundamental principle was understood, in the case of the Cinque Ports; for by a Statute in the Second of William and Mary, it is not enacted only, but declared, that for the Lord Warden to nominate or recommend any Member to serve in any Port or Place within his jurisdiction, was a violation of the Freedom of Parliaments, and contrary to the Antient Laws and Constitution of the Realm.

In the description of these Offences, which constitute a Violation of our Privileges, there is nothing technically narrow, but the Rule is to be tried by its substantial Effects. Force, Fraud, Corrupt practices and undue influence of any sort, by which the freedom of Elections is controlled, have been reprobated in all ages.

These offences, if pursued as matter of personal delinquency, were antiently triable before the Committee of Privileges; if they touched the Seat, they were cognizable in the Committee of Elections. At a later period, when these Committees were united, all such offences were of course tried indiscriminately before this joint jurisdiction. And so things continued until happily the functions of the Committee of Elections were transferred by the Grenville Act to a better Tribunal. But the general conservation and vindication of our Rights and Privileges, except so far as divested by special Statute, still resides, as we all know, in the House at large, and its Committee of Privileges.

Whoever therefore looks into the proceedings of all these several jurisdictions according to their different periods, will find abundant traces of the inquiries which have been instituted, and the censures which have followed upon offences of all these descriptions. And from the period of the Revolution, we may see them exemplified in the prosecutions conducted by sir Edward Seymour against the Directors of the New East India Company in the reign of King William; in the Reports of the Secret Committee upon the last ten years of Sir Robert Walpole's administration during the last reign; in the charge brought

against Lord North upon the Milbourne Port Election, and the general character of these Offences is evidenced by all the language of similar proceedings, in our own time.

But, Sir, beyond this:—Practices of this description are not only offences by the Law of Parliament, they have been long since adjudged to be criminal by the Common Law of the Realm.

The Bribery of Votes was adjudged by the Court of King's Bench, in the early part of the present Reign, to have been a Common Law Offence, even though no precedents could be adduced to show it, and to have been punishable as such long before its increased prevalence made Parliament deem it necessary to restrain it by special Statutes. And in like manner any previous agreement or compact to control the Votes of Electors (even although the Electors are not themselves bribed) has been adjudged to be illegal upon general grounds of policy and jurisprudence.—Such was the Case which arose in the Burgh of Stirling in the year 1773, where some of the Town Council had entered into a corrupt Agreement to divide the Profits of the Burgh, and what they were also pleased to call the Parliamentary Profits, and to bring no person into the Magistracy but such as should vote with them upon all Parliamentary Elections; under this Agreement, Elections were had and passed unanimously. But when this Agreement was discovered and questioned, although it was manifest that the other Electors were neither party nor privy to the Agreement, nor had profited thereby, the Court of Session not only declared the Agreement itself to be illegal, unwarrantable, and *contra bonos mores*, but also that by reason of the undue influence under which such Elections were had, all those Elections were void and null. This Judgment afterwards came by Appeal to the House of Lords, and was there, in November 1775, affirmed.—At a later date, another question of this sort came before an Election Committee under the Grenville Act, from the county of Berwick, in 1781. The Petition there stated that two of the Candidates had by themselves, and friends, combined to control the Election, by chusing first one of those two Candidates, who should sit for a certain number of years or sessions, and then that the other should be elected to succeed him. The Election Committee before whom that Case was tried and proved, reported the Agreement to be corrupt and illegal, and voided the Election.

What, therefore, it remains for us to do is plain. And as our Ancestors, when they found the censures of Parliament, and the decisions of the Common Law, were insufficient to restrain the growing practice of Bribery to Voters, proceeded to superadd the cumulative penalties of the Statute Law; so also it is for us, who have before us such flagrant proofs that the traffic in Seats has broken through the existing checks, to put it down by a new Prohibitory Law.

And now, Sir, we are brought to the last consideration—whether we can by any safe and practicable Remedy suppress the mischief: And of this I have no doubt, if with sincerity and diligence we apply ourselves to the task.

According to my views of this subject, the Committee will perceive, that I must naturally desire in the first place that our Law should be in itself declaratory; lest we should impair the principle which we are endeavouring to strengthen. The definition or description of the offence should also be marked with such a degree of precision that we may not include in it things or consequences beyond our own intentions. And the prohibitory provisions should be such as are most analogous to the rest of our Election Laws upon corresponding cases.

Of course, the honourable Member who has brought in the present Bill will not be surprized that I should think he has fallen short of the true point, in not making it declaratory. As to the main part of his enactments, he will also be prepared for my dissenting from the use of such lax and wide modes of expression as he has employed; a defect into which it is no peculiar reproach for him to have fallen, as our modern forms of legislation have too much involved all our provisions in language so cumbrous that it is generally difficult to discover their sense and substance, through the multitude of words with which they are overcharged. But beyond this, it is quite impossible for me to consent to that part of his proposed enactment which makes the tenure of Seats in this House dependent upon Judgments to be obtained in the Courts below, or in any way puts the trial of our own Rights out of our own accustomed jurisdiction.

With regard to the Oath proposed by the hon. gentleman, it is such in its present form as I should entirely object to. I do not know that a proper Oath for a proper purpose is in itself an exception-

able provision by law. Nor do I think that for solemnity or importance, so long as any Oaths are used in Election Laws, that any occasion for it could be more suitable; agreeing as I do very much with sir William Blackstone in opinion, that the Oath, if administered to the elected, would be far more effectual than when given to the elector. Nevertheless, knowing that to many persons any form of Oath whatever upon this subject would be highly obnoxious, and not thinking it indispensably necessary to the efficacy of the Bill, I should not be disposed to insist upon it.

What I should require would be, that the party who purchased should not reap the profit of his bargain, but should fall under the same disability as that enacted by the Act of Wm. the Third, which I think would be improved also, if it excluded him not for that vacancy alone, but for the whole Parliament. The party who received the price of his venality should also of course forfeit it, with any further penalty which it might be thought right to superadd.

And, beyond this, I would think it a proper course to declare it by positive law, what is implied by the judgments which I have already cited—that by such traffic each party becomes guilty of a Misdemeanor.

Upon the whole, Sir, that for which I am most anxious is the establishment of the principle; being firmly persuaded that honourable minds, which may have hitherto deviated from what I think was the strait path of their duty, or may have been made to vacillate by the practices which they saw prevailing around them with impunity—will shrink from them with abhorrence, when they find them condemned by a specific law: And other men, if actuated by motives less honourable, will be restrained by fears not less efficacious.

I shall therefore listen with satisfaction to any amendment that goes this length, accompanied by such brief and distinct provisions as may give a reasonable security that its execution will be accomplished.—And I shall be contented to lay aside for the present all questions of doubtful policy or difficult expressions; thinking it better to reserve them for future experience, and, if necessary, for future legislation.

I would presume also to recommend this course to the House, as the most prudent and most likely to contribute to the further progress of this Bill, and itsulti-

mate passing into a law; on my own part most cordially and earnestly hoping for its success, as a measure which has now become indispensable to the honour of this House and of the Country.

TO THE  
INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.,  
LETTER IV.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

*What Sort of Reform ought to be made?*

GENTLEMEN,

I. In stating the question, which we now have to discuss, it is impossible to overlook the circumstance, that there is *one sort of reform* now on foot; that it is now actually before the House of Commons; and, which is, in a most distinguished degree, worthy of your attention, this measure has been entertained, has been kindly received, nursed and dandled, rocked, swathed, and pap-fed by . . . . whom? Why, by those very persons, who voted against censure upon Castlereagh, on the motion relating to his offer to swap a writership for a seat; yes, by those persons, who, when Mr. Madocks distinctly charged Castlereagh, Henry Wellesley, and Perceval (the Tinman's prosecutor), with trafficking in a seat; those persons, who, upon this occasion, voted 310 to 85, that there should be *no inquiry*; and many of whom openly avowed, that the thing was not only common, not only in general use by all ministers, but a thing perfectly proper. Well, now mark, that these persons, on both sides of the House, *approve* of Mr. CURWEN's bill; and, when you consider what their conduct was upon Mr. Madocks's motion, you will easily guess *what they expect from this bill*.

II. This consideration alone furnishes a pretty good presumptive proof, that Mr. CURWEN's bill is not at all calculated to answer any useful purpose; to contribute, even in the smallest degree, towards the checking of those manifold corruptions, and that waste of the public money, under which the nation is now suffering so much disgrace and misery. But, we will not let off this bill so lightly; it requires to be fully exposed; for, under the garb of "a "reform," it tends, in my opinion, to the prolonging, if not perpetuating, the traffic in parliamentary seats, and of course, all those infamous bargains, by which the blood as well as the treasure of the nation become the object of barter. Before,

however, we proceed to an examination into the proposed provisions of this bill; before we proceed to inquire, whether *this* be the *sort* of reform, that is wanted, it is quite necessary for us to trace the progress of this reforming bill; for, in that progress we shall clearly discover, what the 310, who voted against Mr. Madocks's motion, expect from this bill.

III. This bill was introduced before Mr. MADOCKS made his motion, the account of which motion is contained in the motto to this sheet; but, when leave was given to bring in the bill, MR. MADOCKS had given notice of his motion.—Now, mark: the bill has leave to be brought in; and, when Mr. Madocks makes his motion, he is told to wait, and see what effect Mr. Curwen's bill will produce. But, Mr. Madocks's motion having been got over; “a stand” having been made, the two factions seemed determined to throw out the bill altogether; or, at most, to let it go no further than just to get into a committee. This was pretty plainly expressed in the debate of the 26th of May, upon the motion for going into a committee. But, during that debate, corruption received an assault, which appeared to have shaken its nerves. In that debate Sir Francis Burdett expressly denied, that *that House was the Commons' House of Parliament*; he distinctly said: “this House is not now the *Commons of England in Parliament assembled*,” and that he would never again call it so. This speech, which, from beginning to end, was well calculated for the purpose, appears to have excited much sensibility in the SPEAKER, who, after all the other intimations usual upon such occasions, actually called Sir Francis to order. Lord Archibald Hamilton having observed, that, “by the openly avowed and defended corruptions, the House itself *appeared to have disclaimed its title*,” the SPEAKER replied: “It is my duty to call any member to order, who affirms, that *this is not the House of Commons*; and I will do it “as long as the House will support me in it.” Sir Francis resumed with a statement of his reasons for not calling that assembly the House of Commons, which statement was, in a very pointed manner, addressed to the Speaker.—There can be no doubt, that it was *this speech*, which produced, in the mind of the Speaker, a resolution to break through general custom, and to deliver his sentiments, not upon Mr. Curwen's bill, but upon the avowals and doctrines to which he had lately been obliged to listen, and which

he appears to have been convinced must, if suffered to stand as the avowals and doctrines of the House, produce, in a short time, an universal persuasion of the worse-than-uselessness of that House.—Therefore, when the House went into a Committee, on the 1st of June, and, of course, gave the SPEAKER an opportunity of delivering his sentiments, he made that Speech, which is inserted in the former part of this Number, and which, in the newspaper reports, has been read with great interest by all ranks of people.—A new turn has thus been given to the fortunes of Mr. Curwen's bill. The seat-merchants and stand-makers appear to have become less audacious; and, according to present appearances, the bill, with various modifications, will finally pass.—But, what is well worthy of notice here, is, how completely the Speaker justifies all that we have said against the practice of selling seats; against the wretches concerned in such traffic; and as to the mischievous consequences that must arise from it. When, on the ever-memorable 12th of May (it was morning when the division took place) the House by a majority of 310 against 85, declared, that there should be no inquiry, though Mr. Madocks distinctly charged three members of the House with having been concerned in the *sale of a seat*; upon that occasion, there was heard, from all quarters and corners of the House, the exclamation: “a stand! a stand!” “It is,” exclaimed many voices at once, “high time to make a stand against popular encroachment;” just, of course, as if the people were guilty of *insolence* in coming, by one of their representatives, to complain, that seats were bought and sold. But what says the Speaker? The Speaker has seen much and read more about proceedings in parliament; but, he had never either seen or read of any thing like *what he saw and heard*, during the night of the eleventh and the morning of the twelfth of May last, and which I wish with all my soul, the whole of the people of England could have *seen and heard*; for, if they could, there would be no writing necessary about Parliamentary Reform. Conviction would have been, at once, imbibed from a sight of *actions*, such as will never be forgotten, by those who were witnesses of them. What says the Speaker? Does he talk of a stand against popular encroachment? Does he avow the practice of seat-selling, and say that it makes a part of the Constitution? Does he say, with MR. WINDHAM and MR. GEORGE JOHNSTONE, that the sell-

ing of seats was a thing carried on amongst our ancestors to a greater extent than amongst us? No: he says, "that it is a "proposition, at the sound of which our "ancestors would have started with indignation." We have heard the avowal with indignation; and, because we have, in our several meetings, expressed that indignation, we have, by this same House of Commons, been called *factional rabble*. The Speaker, as to this point, has now spoken to the House the sentiments of the people. He has gone full as far as any of us, upon this subject of complaint; and, it is no wonder, that his hearers were, as it is said they were, thunder-struck at his speech, which speech, as to its allegations, was quite equal to any speech of Mr. Madocks.

IV. Now, as to the probable effect of this bill of Mr. Curwen's, for the passing of which bill the Speaker appears to have been so anxious, my opinion has already been stated, that it will be *no reform* at all; that it will only serve the corrupt crew as a pretence for *having made a "moderate reform;"* and that, unless care be taken to watch, detect, and expose the measure in its progress, it will become a source of much deception and mischief.—The Speaker, after expressing his indignation at the doctrine, that it was right for seats in parliament to be bought and sold like stalls in Smithfield; after dwelling upon the profligacy of the open avowal of the long existence of that, for having asserted the existence of which so many men have suffered fine, imprisonment, and pillory; after having reprobated the acknowledged existence of that, for endeavouring to accomplish what would have remedied which, Palmer, Muir, and Gerald were sent to Botany Bay, and Tooke and Hardy were tried for high treason; after having expressed his horror of the conduct of those, who had openly and unblushingly acknowledged, that it had been common for the ministers (to which ever party belonging) to buy and sell seats in parliament, and to bargain for the votes of those members, to whom the said seats were sold; after telling the House, what a scandal this was to the parliament and the country, how directly in violation of every principle of the constitution, the Speaker said distinctly, that, to buy or sell a seat in parliament was, and always had been, *an offence at common law*. Well, then, does not Castlereagh, Henry Wellesley, and Perceval (the Tinman's prosecutor) stand charged, by Mr. Madocks, of this offence? And

have not the House refused to inquire into the matter? Are not these things notorious? And, is not this a pretty good beginning in the way of reform? Have we not great reason to repose confidence in those, who voted against that inquiry? Must not Mr. Curwen's bill, which they approve of, be a fine thing for us? They, several of them, repeatedly declared, that, supposing what Mr. Madocks charged against Castlereagh and Perceval to be true, to the full extent, *they should not think the worse of them for it*. Must not Mr. Curwen's bill be, then, a very pretty *sort of reform*, seeing that these same persons like it very well?—But, let us now come to its provisions. What is its professed *immediate object*? It is this: *to prevent, in future, the sale of seats in the House of Commons*. And what is its ultimate object, *to prevent the members from voting away the people's money, in order that they themselves may pocket a share of it*.—This, turn the question about and about, as long as you please, is the main object, which every man of sense has in view, when he talks of a reform in parliament. The House of Commons, according to the constitution, are the people's stewards; the guardians of the national purse; and, what is complained of in the House, as it now stands, is, that many of the members, many of the guardians of the people's purse, do receive into their own pockets, money voted by them out of that purse.—While this is the case, we, who wish for a reform in parliament, think it downright nonsense to talk of *a representation of the people*; and Mr. Curwen, apparently in the hope of checking the evil, proposes a bill, which, as he seems to think, will prevent the *actual sale of seats, or the exchange of them for offices under the government*. This he proposes to do by *oaths and penalties*. Members are to swear, that they have given no money for their seats, and seat-sellers are to swear that they have made no bargain for any office or title, for any seat placed at the disposition of the minister.—Now, for my part, I am convinced that the Oath, if taken, would have no other effect than that of excluding some few men of fortune and of good intentions, who might otherwise get in by means of their money; for, can any man believe, that the miscreant who should enter the House of Commons with the sole view of turning his vote to a good account, with the sole view of selling the sound of his voice, or of saving his forfeit carcass from the hands of a swindled and justly enraged creditor; can any man, who has not

taken leave of his senses, believe, for one moment, that such a miscreant, if such an one should be found, would hesitate to take Mr. Curwen's, or any other, *oath* that could be tendered to him?—But, does not the Reader see how many ways would and must offer for the evading of any such oath? It would be impossible so to frame a law as to stop up all the crevices that an ingenious rogue would discover. We have already about one hundred and twenty statutes, made for the express purpose of preventing what it is now proposed to prevent; and, they have all been found to be ineffectual. Nay, the Speaker himself tells us, that the thing now to be put a stop to is already an offence at Common Law; and, if *prosecutions* do not now take place against those, who are charged with having committed offences of this sort, what reason have we to suppose, that any law, now to be passed, will, by this same House of Commons, be caused to have effect? If there is to be no punishment for the *past*, why should there be any for the *future*? Many members of the House expressly declared, that they did not think the worse of the ministers for their having been concerned in selling a seat in parliament, supposing the charge to be true; and, what are we to expect, then, from an *oath* intended to prevent the traffic in seats?

— After all, however, the Oath, supposing it to be adopted, and supposing it never to be taken falsely, would not answer, it appears to me, any useful purpose. — What we want is, a House composed of members having interests and feelings in common with *the whole mass of the people of property*; and, how are we to have this as long as an individual returns, of his own will, several members to the House of Commons; and as long as nine tenths of the people of property have no share whatever in returning members to that House?—Mr. Grey's Petition stated, that *one hundred and fifty four individuals* returned *three hundred and seven* members to the House of Commons. This is a notorious fact; and, Mr. Curwen's Oath, supposing it to have all the effect that can possibly be wished for from it, does not pretend to go one inch towards the removal of this evil. All that it professes to do; nay, all that the Speaker himself seemed to hope for from this bill was, that it would cause seats to be *given* in cases where they are now *sold*. He talks of the shame of carrying the seats to a market amongst *strangers*; but appears to have no objection at all to their being given to *rela-*

*tions or friends*.—We will first see how far Mr. Curwen's Oath would be likely to answer the Speaker's purpose, and then we will see how his purpose would square with the interests of the nation.

V. Now, for instance, I, in 1802, saw a *Doctor of Divinity*, who had two seats in the House of Commons to dispose of, at that general election. The Doctor, who had come to London for the purpose, said, in my presence, that his intention was to exchange his seats with the minister for some dignity, or something good, in the church. Whether the swap actually took place, or not, I cannot say; but, such was the reverend trader's intention.—Now, supposing such an intention to have been carried into execution; supposing the Doctor to have been made a *Dean*, or a *Bishop*, and supposing the ministers to have *given* the seats to two of their own tribe, would not these two have taken the oath very safely? Neither the lay minister nor the divine Doctor would have been sworn. They would have had no oath tendered them relative to the transaction; and yet, is it possible to form an idea of any transaction more corrupt, more disgraceful to the parliament, or more injurious to the people?—Suppose the owner of any borough wishes to sell his seats. He offers them to the treasury, and he gets so much money for them, it being, in such a case, by no means difficult to see *whom* the money comes from. Very well: the borough-monger gets his money from the minister, and the minister sends down to the borough a couple of fellows to be elected. When they take their seats, supposing them to have consciences, they swear, and they safely swear, that they have given no money for their seats, and that they know of none that has been given.—Thus, supposing a seat to be actually purchased by the minister with the people's money, and then filled by the minister so as to secure him a devoted voice in the House; supposing this, even then, even in such a flagrant case, Mr. Curwen's Oath might be safely taken by the member returned, and to him alone the Oath would, or could, in such case be tendered.

VI. What, then, is the main tendency of this Bill? Why, to give the Treasury a *monopoly* of the saleable Seats. The member cannot, supposing him to have any regard for an Oath, or to be at all afraid of any of the penalties of the Bill, purchase the seat himself, either directly or indirectly; for, I shall suppose the law so

well contrived as to leave no room for evasion. But, the borough-monger would still *sell*; he must have a market; and, as the Treasury would then be the only market, thither he must carry his article. He would not obtain so high a price; but sell he must, and sell he would, to the minister of the day.—This would be a *reform* with a vengeance. We should see 300 Seats, out of the 658, sold to the Treasury; the Treasury would nominate the members; and those members, bound by Mr. Curwen's bill, and *regarding* an oath and fearing to incur penalties, would readily and safely take the oath prescribed, or take the seats without the oath. That the ministers would take care to put in such persons as they could *trust*, there can be no doubt at all; so that when once a parliament was thus packed, it would be quite impossible to obtain the smallest chance of removing any minister; and, as to *grievances*, the people in India might as well talk of grievances, and with just as much hope of redress.

VII. That this is the sort of "*moderate reform*," which the bill of Mr. Curwen would produce, is, I think, so evident, that it was useless to dwell upon the point so long as I have done. But, even supposing, that the bill should (as the Speaker seems to wish, and to content himself with) prevent the *sale* of seats, and cause them to be given by the patrons to their *friends* and *relations*. Suppose the bill should effect this amiable object, what would it do for the people? How would it contribute towards the independence of parliament?—My lord Shabbaroon, for instance, has got a borough, and he wants money for the couple of seats. But, Mr. Curwen will not let him *sell* them, either to the minister or any body else. He cannot get money for them. Well, then, he must have money's worth; and he seeks a good sinecure either for himself, or some of the sons or younger brothers of the family of Shabbaroon. He, therefore, puts in his sons or brothers or his attorney and steward, or some other persons totally dependent upon him; and, by the votes of these he obtains his object. Would it not, now, be much better to leave the thing as it is; to leave my lord Shabbaroon to sell his seats to persons, who have the money to spare; who may be independent if they will; and who may do, with that independence, a great deal of good; while, if a law cut off the possibility of their getting into the House, their independence must be useless to the country?

VIII. The SPEAKER seems to have conceived the idea, that those borough-mongers, who now notoriously sell their seats to the highest bidder, would, after the passing of Mr. Curwen's bill, not only not attempt to sell seats again, but would be completely divested even of the *desire* to sell them, or even to turn them, in any way, whatever, to pecuniary account! This were, indeed, miraculous. What! take from the borough-monger; the trafficker in seats; the vender of votes; take from such a man the *desire* of still deriving profit from his commodity! Well; if you can do this, Mr. Curwen, your bill is certainly a wonderful invention; but, still, I shall deny, that it is, in any sense of the word, a *reform* of the House of Commons; and I also shall deny, that it will operate to the benefit of the nation. For what do you effect? You put a stop, if this *miracle* takes place, to the selling of seats and to the obtaining of offices from the minister, through the means of disposing of seats to relations and friends and underlings; but, you are still as far as ever from having *representatives of the people*. The members will still, in fact, be the representatives of particular families and individuals; and, at the very best, you will create a new sort of unprincipled opposition to every ministry that the king may choose. Indeed, there would, in this case, arise a much more complete oligarchy than there is at present. The seats, now sold for money, would be kept in hand; and, the decision, upon every question, would depend upon much *fewer free voices*, than are now heard in the House of Commons.

IX. Such is the "*moderate Reform*," which Mr. Curwen has in contemplation; and, by which Reform, if he could get the people to believe in its efficacy, he would, I am fully persuaded, do this country more mischief than has been done to it by any man for the last hundred years, Pitt not excepted; and, it is not the less mortifying to reflect, that there is every reason to suppose, that he is sincerely inclined to do good instead of harm.—There is one passage in the speech of the SPEAKER, which I do not clearly comprehend. It is that, where, in speaking of the effect of the scandalous facts, relative to the traffic in seats, lately come to light, and of the new doctrine, upon which the sale of seats has been justified in the House, he says: "it furnishes the most formidable weapons to those, who are professing, "and, I am willing to believe, sincerely

“ professing, to *reform*, but, as I fear, are, in truth and in fact, by the tendency of their endeavours, labouring to *subvert*, the entire system of our Parliamentary Representation.” —I will not affect to misunderstand, that the Speaker here alludes to those, who, at the public meetings, recently held, in different parts of the kingdom, have declared for a Reform in the Commons’ House of Parliament; but, I really do not see the consistency of suspecting such persons of endeavouring, though unintentionally, to *subvert* our system of Parliamentary Representation, when the avowed object of those persons, is, to do away, in the most effectual manner, the evil of which the Speaker complains. To be sure, they mean to go much further; they, and for the reasons which I have stated, see nothing at all in a plan like Mr. Curwen’s, but the very likely means of deceiving weak people; of spreading delusion in the country; of drawing a crust over the wound, and thereby rendering the cure more difficult, and leaving small chance of life, except from amputation. In short, what they want is, a *representation of the people*; they want the House of Commons to be *in fact*, what it is *in name*. “ Would that men ‘should be what they seem; or that they ‘should seem none!’” This is the maxim they act upon. They think it would be a great deal better to have no House of Commons at all, than to have a House of Commons, the seats in which should be bought and sold; but, they are, at the same time, fully convinced, that, unless the people really have the *choosing* of the members, it can be of no consequence at all to them, whether the seats be saleable, or not. If, through the operation of a measure, like that of Mr. Curwen, the monopoly of seats were fixed in the Treasury, and the chance of seeing an independent man lay out his money for a borough were completely done away, we should think our situation a little worse than it now is; but, as to whether seats are sold or not; as to whether some hawks, who has a desire to gild the remnant of his life with a title, takes money or takes empty sound for his seats; this is a matter of very little consequence to the people. Their sufferings and disgrace; the profigate waste of their money, and the disregard of their feelings, arise from such hawks having seats at his disposal at all. It is his *possessing* of the seats, which is the curse to them; and this is a curse, which Mr. Curwen’s bill does not attempt to remove.

That bill is, in short, little more than a measure for *regulating* the traffic in parliamentary seats, while it professes to *put an end* to that traffic. And, is it, then, possible, that the Speaker can suppose, that those, who really wish for Reform, will be satisfied with a measure like this?

X. Whatever the Speaker may suppose, Gentlemen, certainly we, who see and who most sorely feel the evils of a system, which, in fact, deprives the people of all voice in the Legislature, shall not be satisfied with any such measure; which, were there no other objection to it, would and must be looked upon with a very suspicious eye, when we see it applauded, when we see it cherished with the kindest attentions, by all those who were the very loudest in opposition to *Mr. Wardle*. We shall find, in our county, that all the well-known peculators and plunderers, all the slaves, who dance attendance upon the great distributor of government favours, will approve of this bill; of this measure, so well calculated to enable them to spread deception through the county, and to enable them to impose upon the unreflecting, by representing a *reform* as having been *begun* by the House of Commons itself. It is surprising how harmoniously all those, who hate the idea of *real reform*, chime in, in praise of this bill of Mr. Curwen. Even the hired news-papers; the papers, which, in a late debate, Mr. Whitbread openly declared to be in the employ of the government; even these downright hired vehicles, part of whose business it is to stifle inquiry into abuses, and to traduce and vilify every man who is an enemy to corruption; even these publications highly approve of Mr. Curwen’s bill, which they call a “ *temperate reform*.”

XI. This is not the Reform that we want. We want a Reform, not that shall consist of new regulations about the manner of disposing of seats; not of prohibitions or permissions, relative to the bargain and sale for offices and seats; we want a Reform, not to consist of a statute to prescribe whether our rights shall be *sold*, *swapped*, or *given* away, but that shall restore those rights to us, their owners. If I find a man has taken away, or, by any means, got possession, of my *field*, I do not, in my proceedings against him, complain of the *manner in which he uses my field*; whether he ploughs it or plants it or lays it down in grass, or whether he lets it to another or keeps it in his own hands. I do not trouble myself with

these matters, with which, indeed, I have nothing to do. I see him in possession of what belongs to me, and I demand it from him; and, really, Mr. Curwen's bill does appear to me as being something like an action in such a case for misuse of the field, instead of an endeavour to recover the field itself. The people demand the right of choosing persons to fill the seats. They, in other words, demand possession of the seats, which they assert to be their own. The justice of the claim is not denied; but, says Mr. Curwen's bill: "let us be *temperate*. You must not 'have your seats. That is too much to 'demand. But, we will take care, that, 'in future, those who have your seats 'shall not sell them (except, perhaps, to 'the minister) but shall give them away.'" Pretty consolation, truly! Almost as good as if a man, when complaining of another for having stolen his horse, were told that the horse was never to be sold again, and only let out to hire once in a time. There may be persons; I do not positively aver, that there are not persons, who may expect some good from this bill; but, to me, I must confess that it appears to be capable of nothing which will not be injurious to the country.

XII. There is one thing, however, which, supposing the bill to pass, may lead to good; and, that is, a *speedy dissolution of parliament*; for, if it be true, that the present House of Commons have been returned in a manner that requires this bill; if the Speaker's description of the state of things be correct; if the provisions of the bill be necessary to insure proper members of parliament; if this be so, the King ought to be addressed to dissolve the House as soon as possible; because, in this very measure the people have wherewith to appeal to, in order to shew, that they were not fairly dealt by in the returning of this House of Commons. At any rate, the members of the House ought now to take the purgatory oath proposed by the bill. "No, no," Mr. Perceval will say, perhaps, "it is not a good way to punish *past offences*." Very true, though you did not think so in the case of Hamlin; but, observe, we do not want to punish at all; we only want this House, which has still the power of making laws to bind us, and will have that power for four or five years yet, to come, to take this oath, whence we are to derive such amazing security; for, it is a shocking thing, Mr. Curwen, to leave us four or five years to wait for the beginning of the

operation of your measure. This is indeed, the most "*temperate* and *moderate*" Reform" I ever heard of in my life. It is a sort of *reversionary* Reform. In short, it is a Reform that will never take place. The bill may pass into a law; but, long before the time for acting upon it shall come, either it will have been set aside, by a real Reform of the House of Commons, or it will be too late to talk of Reform, or of any thing else whereby to preserve the liberties of the people and the independence of the country.

Having, in this Letter, endeavoured to shew what sort of Reform we do *not* want, I shall, in my next, give you my opinion as to the sort of Reform that we do want.

I am,  
Your friend,  
WM. COBBETT.

*Botley, 8 June, 1809.*

#### LORD GAMBIER

Has, it is said, demanded a Court-martial, in consequence of certain opinions, said to have been expressed, relative to his conduct, by Lord Cochrane. The COURIER, one of the real hireling papers, has the following paragraph upon the subject:—  
 "Upon this interesting subject a circumstance has come to our knowledge which we are enabled to communicate without the fear of contradiction. It has been a matter of surprise to many, that the important consequences resulting to the service from the late display of skill and gallantry in Basque Roads to which we allude, were not sanctioned by the thanks of Parliament to lord Gambier, and the officers and men under his command. This honourable and gratifying mark of approbation was, however, certainly intended to have been moved by his majesty's ministers; but the design having been communicated to lord Cochrane, who distinguished himself in so signal a way in Basque Roads, his lordship declared, that he should, if he stood alone in the House of Commons, oppose the Motion. This declaration led of course to further discussion, and lord Gambier considered himself bound to appeal for the justification of his conduct to the Court, which will be held with all possible dispatch. Many of the officers who served on the occasion, are now at home, and they have been officially informed, that their presence will be necessary."—Now, can this possibly be true? What! would Lord Gambier have been thanked had it not been for the threat-

ened opposition of Lord Cochrane; Just as if a cabinet of great big ministers and statesmen need care for what this Scotch Lord could say; who, besides, is a notorious “Jacobin,” and who, the very first week he was in parliament, made that mischievous motion about the gentlemen and ladies, who do us the honour to live upon our labour, under the names of sinecure and pension holders, including Mr. and Mrs. WARD. Just as if the threats of a person like this would prevent the great and mighty Lord Mulgrave from moving the Houses of Parliament to a vote of thanks to his friend! It cannot be. It is slander. And, yet, this is not the first time, that it has been said, that Lord Gambier has demanded a court-martial. There must be something in that. Well; he certainly is the best judge of whether he *ought to be tried*, or not; and all that I shall say upon the subject is, that I most sincerely wish *he may have his due.*

#### AUSTRIA, SPAIN, and PORTUGAL.

With respect to these countries the most remarkable thing is, that, if we do not assist “our allies,” as they are jocularly called, with any thing else, we do our share in the way of *rejoicing*. Not above six days ago, we fired the *Park and Tower* guns for what Mr. Whitbread says was no more than an attack upon SOULT’s rear guard; for a “victory,” in short such as would scarcely have been, in the French army, rewarded with a *musket-of-honour*, given to some serjeant, commanding a detachment. We have wasted as much powder in honour of the Wellesley victories in Portugal as would, if properly employed, have gained a victory indeed. When Buonaparté gains victories, he sends home the *standards* he takes. Where are the *standards* taken in Portugal? But, we are become a bragging nation; and we shall go on bragging to the end of the chapter.

—What we are at in Spain and Portugal I cannot imagine. What is the use of any thing we can do, unless the Spaniards themselves can immediately drive out the French? Can any man, who has but half his senses left, imagine, that if the French remain in Spain, ‘till Napoleon has settled Austria, Spain will not be soon afterwards subdued? —We are told about the JUNTA’s calling the *Cortez* together. But does not the reader clearly see, that the Junta will be guided by our ministers; and has he not recently heard MR. CANNING at a tavern dinner, with his rabble of contractors about him; standing up by

the side of his brother poet and sinecure-placeman, FITZGERALD, and proclaiming to the blood-sucking crew, that war was still to be made for *Ferdinand VII?* Besides, is not Lord Wellesley gone to Spain? —It is nonsense, then, to talk of the Junta’s making efforts for the liberties of the people of Spain. We are at war for Ferdinand VII, and so must the Junta be at war; and, so will not *the people* be at war. —We have, at this time, an army of 18,000 men in *Sicily*; and, for what? They may be reduced to 14 or 15,000, perhaps; but, what do they do there? These men might be very usefully employed elsewhere; and, in Sicily they are doing nothing, and can do nothing, except it be to keep the people of the country in awe. But, will this save the country from the French? The French have three times the number of men in Calabria. The distance is a mere trifle. Is it wise to waste our means in this way? Is there much reason in keeping from 12,000 to 18,000 English troops to take care of Sicily, while we keep about as many foreign troops to assist us kindly in *taking care of England?* I should like to hear the answer, which either the late or the present ministry would have to this question. I should like to see them *closely pressed* upon this point, for it is one, relative to which the public wants, and has a right to have, information. —It is surprising, but very pleasing to see, how little interest is excited, now-a-days, by the wars upon the continent. The battles between France and Austria really do not excite so much attention as a boxing match or an elopement of the Paget and Wellesley cut. This is very good. One of the purpose of Pitt’s wars was to engage the attention of the people; to draw their eyes off’ from home. That cannot now be done. We have fixed our eyes, thanks to Mr. Wardle, fast upon St. Stephen’s. That is the scene that we have to look to. I do hope, that no crafty knave will be able to invent any thing to draw the people’s attention from this point. —No; let us not be cheated again.

#### THE COURT-MARTIAL.

In my next, being a double number, I will take up this subject; and, if I do not shew those *who have caused* this publication to be made, and to be circulated at such immense expence; if I do not shew them to be the *falsest*, the *most base, mean, and dirty*, of mankind, I will confess myself to merit all those epithets.

## COBBETT'S Parliamentary Debates:

The TWELFTH VOLUME of the above Work will be ready for delivery on the first of July. All communications, if sent to the Publisher's in due time, shall be carefully attended to.

### PROCEEDINGS

*In COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &c. relative to the recent INQUIRY in the House of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK. (Continued from p. 555.)*

#### CITY OF BRISTOL.

At a Meeting of the Citizens of Bristol, convened at the Guildhall, the 26th day of May 1809.—William Coates, esq. in the Chair.—It was Resolved,

1. That at this momentous period, when the people are testifying the high sense they entertain of their superior rights as Britons by the sacrifices they daily make of many of the comforts, if not of the necessities of life, for the maintenance and defence of the state, they have an undoubted right to insist, that those who are entrusted with the administration of public affairs, should at least abstain from undisguised profligacy and notorious corruption.

2. That G. L. Wardle, esq. in his parliamentary exertions respecting the conduct of his royal highness the late Commander in Chief, displayed that zealous vigilance for the public welfare, that clear discernment, that pure disinterestedness, that inextinguishable ardour, and that unshaken constancy, which characterise the true patriot. That he has thereby justly acquired the admiration and gratitude of every uncorrupted member of the community, and he is requested to accept this heartfelt acknowledgement from the citizens of Bristol now assembled.

3. That our Thanks are due to sir F. Burdett, bart. for the consistency of his conduct in seconding Mr. Wardle's motion for inquiry; to lord Folkestone for his early and steady support of the measure; to Mr. Whitbread and sir S. Romilly, for their able exertions during its progress; and to general Ferguson, lord Archibald Hamilton, Mr. Madocks, and such other members of the house of commons, as by their virtuous co-operation proved themselves to be the actual representatives of the people.

4. That during the late Inquiry, we observed with the deepest regret, that in an assembly of persons styling themselves the representatives of the people, the influence of public opinion was unblushingly contemned, and its legitimacy openly denied; but we triumph in the reflection, that the authority which his majesty's ministers dared to revile, they have found themselves compelled to obey.

5. That we consider the late happy detection of lord Castlereagh in his foul attempt on the Constitution, as a pledge on the part of the virtuous representatives of the people, that they will not slumber at their posts until our formidable enemy, corruption, be completely subdued.

6. That we look with confidence to a speedy and effectual Reform of the Commons House of Parliament, as the only means of rooting out corruption; and in effecting that Reform, we earnestly deprecate the insidious interference of those who are themselves profiting by the continuance of state abuses and reversionary sinecures.

7. That we seek no other Reform than such as shall insure to us the restoration of that free and glorious Constitution which our forefathers so bravely acquired; which they again and again so manfully asserted, and which they so religiously transmitted to their posterity as their best, their inalienable birthright.

8. That our Thanks are due to Mr. John Winter, jun. and the other independent citizens at whose instance this Meeting was convened.

9. That copies of these Resolutions be subscribed by the Chairman in the name of the Meeting, and be transmitted by him to Mr. Wardle, sir F. Burdett, lord Folkestone, sir S. Romilly, Mr. Whitbread; general Ferguson, lord A. Hamilton, and Mr. Madocks.

10. That our acknowledgments are due to Mr. Matthew Mills Coates, for the Resolutions this day adopted, and for his zealous and able exertions on the present occasion.

#### COUNTY OF HEREFORD.

At a General Meeting of the Freeholders of the County of Hereford, convened in the Shire Hall, on Friday the 19th May, by the Gentlemen, whose Requisition for that purpose had been declined by the High Sheriff.—The right hon. the earl of Oxford in the Chair.—It was Resolved unanimously,

1. That the Thanks of the Freeholders

of this county be given to G. L. Wardle, esq. for the zeal, courage, and patriotism with which (regardless of the threats of men in power) he persevered in bringing to light the corrupt practices in the office of Commander in Chief.

2. That the Thanks of the Freeholders of this county be given to sir F. Burdett, bart. for having seconded: and to lord Folkestone, for having so ably supported, Mr. Wardle.

3. That the Thanks of the Freeholders of this county be given to the 125 members of the House of Commons, who formed the Minority on Mr. Wardle's motion.

4. That with pleasure and gratitude we have observed the names of Thomas Foley, Thomas Powel Symonds, and Richard Philip Scudamore, esquires, in that honourable list.

5. That the Vote of the House of Commons on that occasion (which appears to us to be equally opposite to the Evidence adduced, and to the sentiments of the people of England), adds to our conviction of the necessity of a temperate Reform in Parliament.

6. That the heavy pressure of public taxes (which have even reached the necessities of life) renders it of the utmost importance, that faithful representatives should watch with jealousy the expenditure of the public revenue.

7. That if pensions and lucrative places (which are represented to amount to £78,994*l.* per annum, and to be received by 78 members of the House of Commons) continue to be given to the members of that house, it is vain for the people to expect their opinions to be there expressed.

8. That our only object in recommending a Reform in Parliament is to obtain for the people their acknowledged share in the government, and thereby to secure the blessings of our invaluable Constitution.

9. That the Chairman be requested to inform the members for this county, that the Freeholders here assembled, expect them to support any motion having for its object a temperate Reform of Parliament.

10. That the Chairman be also requested to inform colonel Wardle, sir F. Burdett, and lord Folkestone, of the Resolutions thanking them. (Signed)

OXFORD, Chairman.

The earl of Oxford having quitted the Chair, the Thanks of the Meeting were unanimously voted to his lordship for taking the Chair, and for his able conduct in it.

(To be continued.)

### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

FRENCH ARMY IN AUSTRIA.—*Third Bulletin,*  
dated Burghausen, April 30.

The Emperor arrived in Muhldorf on the 27th inst. in the evening. His majesty detached the division of general Wrede to Lauffen on the Salza, in order to overtake the corps, which the enemy had in the Tyrol, and which was retreating by forced marches. General Wrede overtook the enemy's rear on the 25th, near Lauffen, took the baggage, and made many prisoners; but the enemy had sufficient time to cross the river and burn the bridge. On the 27th the duke of Dantzig arrived in Wanzenburgh, and on the 28th in Altenmark. On the 29th gen. Wrede continued his march to Saltzburgh; about three leagues from the town he found the advanced posts of the enemy's army. The Bavarians pursued them closely and entered the town with them. General Wrede assures us that the division of general Jellachich is completely destroyed. That general has thus been punished for the scandalous proclamation by which he put the dagger in the hands of the Tyrolese. The Bavarians have taken 5000 prisoners, and found considerable magazines in Saltzburgh. On the 28th, at break of day, the duke of Istria arrived in Burghausen, and his advanced parties took post on the right bank of the Inn. The same day the duke of Montebello arrived in Burghausen. Count Bertrand exerted himself to the utmost to restore the bridge, which had been burnt by the enemy. It was completed on the 30th, and the whole army crossed the river. On the 28th a detachment of 50 horse chasseurs, commanded by captain Margaron, arrived in Dittmoning, where he fell in with a battalion of the famous militia, styled Landwhes, which, on his approach, retreated into a neighbouring wood. Capt. Margaron summoned them to surrender; after much deliberation, 1000 men of that valiant militia, posted in a thick wood, altogether inaccessible to cavalry, surrendered to 50 chasseurs. The Emperor wished to see them; they really excite compassion; they are badly armed, worse accoutred, and commanded by superannuated officers of artillery. The cruel and overbearing temper of the Austrians fully displayed itself in the moment of apparent success, when they occupied Munich. The high bailiff of Muhldorf was arrested by them and shot. An inhabitant of Muhldorf, of the name of

Starck, who had obtained a badge of distinction from the king of Bavaria, for the services which, during the last war, he rendered to the army, has been taken up and sent to Vienna, to stand his trial. The high bailiff of Burghausen, count Armansperg, has also been sent to Lintz, and from thence to Vienna, because in the year 1805 he did not comply with a requisition addressed to them on the part of the Austrians. The Bavarians will no doubt give a minute and faithful account of the acts of wanton cruelty committed by the Austrians in this country, that the memory thereof may be preserved by their most remote posterity, although it is extremely probable that this was the last insult which Austria will be able to offer to the allies of France. The Austrians have endeavoured, both in the Tyrol and Westphalia, to invite the inhabitants to rise in rebellion against their sovereigns. Austria has raised numerous armies, divided into corps like the French army; her troops are moving by forced marches, to imitate the French troops; her generals are publishing bulletins, proclamations, general orders—all in imitation of the French. But the ass is not ennobled to a lion because he is covered with a lion's skin; the long ears betray the ignoble beast. The Emperor of Austria has left Vienna, and on his departure published a proclamation, drawn up by Gentz, in the style and spirit of the most ridiculous performances of that kind. He is gone to Scharding, a position extremely well adapted for a sovereign, who neither wishes to be in his capital to govern his dominions, nor in the field, where he is known to be merely an incumbrance and dead weight. When he was informed of the result of the battle of Echmühl, he judged it prudent to leave the banks of the Inn, and retire into the interior of his dominions. The town of Scharding, which is now occupied by the duke Rivoli, has suffered much. The Austrians on their retreat set fire to their magazines, and burnt half the town which belonged to them. They had no doubt some presentiment of their future fate, that what belonged to Austria shall no longer belong to her.

*Fourth Bulletin, dated Brannau, 1st May.*

On the crossing of the bridge at Landshut, brigadier gen. Latour gave proofs of valour and coolness. Col. Lauriston placed the artillery advantageously, and contributed much to the happy issue of this splendid affair.—The bishop and the prin-

cipal public functionaries of Salzburg repaired to Burghausen, to implore the clemency of the Emperor for the country. His Majesty gave them his assurance, that they should never again come under the dominion of the House of Austria. They engaged to take measures for recalling the four battalions of the militia which the Circle had delivered, and of which part were dispersed and fled.—The head quarters are to be this day removed to Ried. At Brannau, magazines were found with 200,000 rations of biscuit, and 6,000 sacks of oats. The Circle of Ried has furnished three battalions for the militia, but the greater part of them are returned again to their habitations. The Emperor of Austria was three days at Brannau; he was at Scharding when he heard of the defeat of his army. The inhabitants consider him as the principal cause of the war. The famous volunteers of Vienna passed through this place after their defeat at Landshut, throwing away their arms, and carrying with them in all haste their terror to Vienna.—On the 21st of April an Imperial Decree was published in the capital, declaring the ports to be again opened to the English, the treaties with this ancient ally renewed, and hostilities against the common enemy begun.—Gen. Oudinot has taken prisoners a battalion of 1,000 men, between Altham and Ried. This battalion was without cavalry and artillery. On the approach of our troops, they made an attempt to fire with their small arms, but being surrounded on all sides by the cavalry, were obliged to lay down their arms. His majesty caused several brigades of light cavalry to pass in review at Burghausen, and among others those of Hesse Darmstadt; at whose appearance he was pleased to express his satisfaction. Gen. Marulaz, under whose command the corps stands, presented several of them, to whom his majesty was pleased to grant decorations of the Legion of Honour. Gen. Wrede has intercepted a courier, on whom were found a number of letters, from which we may perceive the state of confusion in which the kingdom is.

*Fifth Bulletin, dated Enns, 4th May.*

On the 1st of May gen. Oudinot, after having made 1,400 prisoners, penetrated beyond Ried, where he took 400 more, so that he this day took 1,500 men without firing a single gun.—The town of Brannau was a strong place of sufficient importance, since it commanded a bridge on the river, which forms the frontier of Austria. In

a spirit of inconsistency worthy this weak cabinet, it destroyed a fortress situated on a frontier where it might be of great utility, in order to build one at Comorn, in the midst of Hungary. Posterity will with difficulty credit this excess of inconsistency and folly.—The Emperor arrived at Ried on the 2d of May, at one of the morning, and at Lambach, at one of the afternoon of the same day.—At Ried were found an establishment of eight sets of military ovens, and magazines containing 20,000 quintals of flour.—The bridge of Lambach, on the Traun, had been cut by the enemy; it was re-established during the day.—On the same day the duke of Istria commanding the cavalry, and the duke of Montebello, with the corps of Oudinot, entered Wels. In this town were found a bakery, 12 or 15,000 quintals of flour, and magazines of wine and brandy.—The duke of Dantzig, who arrived the 30th April at Saltzburg, instantly caused one brigade to march towards Kurstein and another towards Rastadt, in the direction of the Italian roads. His advanced guard, pursuing gen. Jellachich, forced him from the strong post at Colling.—On the 1st of May, the head-quarters of the duke of Rivoli were at Scharding. Adj. gen. Trinqualye, commanding the advanced guard of the division of St. Cyr, met at Riedau, on the road to Neumarkt, with the advanced guard of the enemy. The Wurtemburg light horse, the Baden dragoons, and three companies of voltigeurs of the 4th regiment of the French line, as soon as they perceived the enemy, attacked, and pursued him to Neumarkt. They killed 50 men, and took 500 prisoners.—The Baden dragoons valiantly charged an half-battalion of the regiment of Jordis, and compelled them to lay down their arms. Lient. col. D'Emmerade, who commanded them, had his horse pierced with stabs from the bayonet, major Sainte Croix took with his own hand a flag from the enemy. Our loss consists of three men killed, and 50 wounded. The duke of Rivoli continued his march on the 2d, and arrived at Lintz on the 3d. The archduke Lewis and gen. Hiller, with the remains of their corps, reinforced by a reserve of grenadiers, and by all that the country could afford them, were before the Traun with 35,000 men; but menaced with being turned by the duke of Montebello, they proceeded to Ebersberg, in order to pass the river.—On the 3d, the duke of Istria and gen. Oudinot marched towards Ebersberg, and effected a junction with the duke of Rivoli. They

met the Austrian rear-guard before Ebersberg. The intrepid battalions of the tirailleurs of the Po, and the Corsican tirailleurs, pursued the enemy, who was passing the bridge, drove into the river the cannon, waggons, and from eight to nine hundred men, and took in the town from three to four thousand men, whom the enemy had left there for its defence. Gen. Claparede, whose advanced guard was these battalions, pursued them. He halted at Ebersberg, and found 30,000 Austrians occupying a superb position. The duke of Istria passed the bridge with his cavalry, in order to support the division, and the duke of Rivoli ordered his advanced guard to be strengthened by the main body of the army. The remains of the corps of prince Lewis and gen. Hiller were lost without resource. In this extreme danger the enemy set fire to the town, which was built of wood. The fire spread in an instant in every direction. The bridge was soon enveloped, and the flames seized the joists, which it was necessary to cut.—Neither cavalry nor infantry was able to act; and the division of Claparede alone, with only four pieces of cannon, fought during three hours against 30,000 men. This battle of Ebersberg is one of the finest military occurrences, the memory of which can be preserved by history. The enemy seeing the division of Claparede cut off without any communication, advanced three times against it, and was always received and stopped by the bayonet. At length after a labour of three hours, the flames were turned aside, and a passage opened. The gen. of division, Legrand, with the 26th light infantry and the 18th of the line, marched towards the castle, which the enemy had occupied with 800 men. The sappers broke in the doors, and the flames having reached the castle, all who were within perished there. Gen. Legrand afterwards marched to the assistance of Claparede's division. Gen. Durosnel, who advanced to the right shore, with 1,000 horse, joined himself to him, and the enemy was obliged to retreat with great haste. On the first report of these events, the Emperor had himself marched up the right shore, with the divisions of Nansoutz and Moliter.—The enemy, who retreated with the greatest rapidity, arrived at night at Enns, burnt the bridge, and continued his flight on the road to Vienna. His loss consists of 12,000 men, of which 7,500 are prisoners. We also possess four pieces of cannon and two standards. The division of Claparede, which consti-

tutes a part of the grenadiers of Oudinot, covered itself with glory. It has lost 300 men killed and 600 wounded. The impetuosity of the tirailleurs of the Po, and the Corsican tirailleurs, attracted the attention of our army. The bridge, the town, and the position at Ebersberg, will be lasting monuments of their courage. The traveller will stop and say, "It is here, from these superb positions, from this long bridge, and this castle so strong from its situation, that an army of 35,000 Austrians was driven into flight by 7,000 Frenchmen."—Cohorn, general of brigade, an officer of singular intrepidity, had his horse killed under him. Colonels Cardenan and Lendy were killed.—A company of the Corsican battalion pursuing the enemy into the woods, made alone 700 prisoners.—During the affair of Ebersberg, the duke of Montebello arrived at Steyer, where he rebuilt the bridge which the enemy had cut.—The Emperor sleeps to-day at Evans, in the castle of Prince Auersperg: to-morrow will be spent in rebuilding the bridge. The Deputies of the States of Upper Austria were presented to his Majesty at his bivouac at Ebersberg. The citizens of all classes, and from all the provinces, allow that the emperor Francis II. is the aggressor: they expect great changes, and admit that the House of Austria has merited all its misfortunes. They accuse, even openly, the feeble, obstinate, and perfidious character of their sovereign, as the author of their afflictions: they manifest the deepest gratitude for the generosity which the emperor Napoleon shewed towards the capital and countries he had conquered. In common with all Europe, they are indignant at the resentment and hatred which the emperor Francis has not ceased to nourish against a nation which had been so noble and magnanimous towards him. Thus, in the opinion even of the subjects of our enemy, victory is on the side of the good cause.

*Sixth Bulletin, dated Saint Polten, May 9.*

The prince of Ponte Corvo, who commands the 9th corps, composed in a great measure of the Saxon army, and which has marched near the Bohemian frontier, spreading disquietude every where, has caused the Saxon general Gutschmitt to march to Egra. This general has been well received by the inhabitants, whom he has ordered to dismiss the landwher

(militia.) On the 6th the head-quarters of the prince of Ponte Corvo were at Retz, between Bohemia and Ratisbon.—One Schill, a sort of robber, who was covered with crimes during the last campaign of Prussia, and who had obtained the rank of colonel, has deserted from Berlin with his whole regiment, and repaired to Wittemberg, on the Saxon frontier. He has environed that town. General Lestocq has issued a Proclamation against him as a deserter. This ridiculous movement was concerted with the party which wished to send fire and blood through Germany.—His Majesty has ordered the formation of a corps of observation of the Elbe, which will be commanded by the duke of Walmy, and composed of 60,000 men. The advanced guard is ordered to proceed to Hanau.—The duke of Montebello crossed the Enns at Steyer on the 4th, and arrived on the 5th at Amstetten, where he met the enemy's advanced guard. Colbert, gen. of brigade, caused the 20th regiment of horse chasseurs to charge a regiment of Ulans, of whom 500 were taken. The young Lauriston, 18 years of age, and who but six months ago was a page, after a singular combat, vanquished the commander of the Ulans, and took him prisoner. His Majesty has granted him the decoration of the Legion of Honour.—On the 6th, the duke of Montebello arrived at Molek, the duke of Rivoli at Amstetten, and the duke of Auerstadt at Lintz.—The remains of the corps of the archduke Lewis and general Hiller quitted Saint Polten on the 7th. Two-thirds passed the Danube at Crems; they were pursued to Mautern, where the bridge was found broken: the other third took the direction of Vienna.—On the 8th, the head-quarters of the Emperor were at St. Polten.—The head-quarters of the duke of Montebello are to-day at Sigart-kirchen. The duke of Dantzig is marching from Saltsburgh to Inspruck, in order to attack in the rear the detachment which the enemy has still in the Tyrol, and which troubled the frontiers of Bavaria.—In the cellars of the abbey of Molek, were found several thousand bottles of wine, which are very useful for the army. It is not till beyond Molek that the wine country begins. It follows from the accounts delivered in, that the army has found, since the passage of the Inn, in the different magazines of

*(To be continued.)*

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 24.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 17, 1809.

[Price 1s.

" Let high Birth triumph. What can be more great?  
" Nothing——but Merit in a low estate."

YOUNG.

897]

[895

TO THE

INDEPENDENT PEOPLE OF HAMPSHIRE.

*The Court-Martial.*

GENTLEMEN,

In a former Letter, I spoke to you upon the subject of the *personal attacks*, which the associates in corruption were making upon me; of which attacks I shall now speak to you more fully; because, an exposition of the falsehood and malice of our enemies will strongly tend to shew, not only that their cause is bad, but that they know it to be bad, and that they have neither fact nor argument to advance in its defence. The truth is this: they see plainly, that, unless they can, by some means or other, destroy the effect of my publications, those publications will, in time, destroy corruption and public-robbery; that is to say, destroy the meat which they feed upon; and, therefore, it is no wonder, that they are making such efforts to destroy the effect of those publications; and, yet, being quite destitute of the means of meeting me in the field of discussion; being quite unable to make head, to stand one moment, against me there, they have recourse to personal attack, just as if any thing that I did twenty years ago could have any connection with what I am now writing upon the subject of Parliamentary Reform; just as if my having acted thus or thus, while I was in the army, could have any connection with what I have now said about the Vote of the \$10 upon Mr. Madocks's motion, or about the decision with respect to Castle-reagh, Wellesley, and Perceval, compared with the prosecution and sentence of Philip Hamlin. I am accusing the associates in corruption of various crimes against the people; I am exposing their robberies to the people; and I am proposing the means of preventing such robberies in future. Why do not the corrupt defend themselves, if they can? Is it common for the thief to attack the lawyer who is pleading against him? And, if he were to do it, would that gain him any credit with the

jury, or at all tend to save his neck? Of this, one would think, the public robbers must be aware; but, they are so stung; they smart so severely; they are so full of resentment, against all who are not public robbers, that they cannot subdue their passions to the command of reason. Against me, in particular, they entertain such mortal antipathy, that I am sure there is nothing but their cowardice that withholds them from attempting assassination. In *this county* especially they are desperate. They have (to whichever set, or gang, they belong) here seen all the respectable part of the people turn their backs upon them with disdain, after having, for so many years, been the dupes of one gang or the other; and this (to them) alarming change they ascribe principally to me. No wonder, therefore, that they are not very nice in their attempts to obtain vengeance.

Some of these attempts I noticed in a former Letter, where I spoke of some of the falsehoods and misrepresentations they had made use of. I have now to speak of their last attempt; and, having so done; having once more shown the falsehood, the malice, the incomparable baseness of the Associates in Corruption, I will never again take up any part of my paper, or the time of my Readers, with answering any thing that shall be published against me personally. The vile wretches have now published, at an enormous expence; an expence of not less, perhaps, than *ten thousand pounds*, a thing which they pretend is a true account of a COURT-MARTIAL, in which I was concerned, at the time of my leaving the army, in 1792. Why, Gentlemen, they might, when they were at it, as well have gone the full length of the enemies of England in America, and published an account of my being *tried for my life and left for execution*. They might as well have accused me of high-way robbery, house-breaking, or any other offence. There would have been as much truth in such a charge, as in what they have now published, which is a falsehood, from one end to the other, as to what

it means to cause to be believed respecting me. It contains, like most other deliberate falsehoods, something which is true in words; but, then, the meaning is totally perverted by the suppression of all the material parts of the transaction. Suppose you were to say, "If selling seats in parliament be not punished, it is a shame to hang a poor fellow for house-breaking." Suppose you were to say this; and I, pretending to give an account of what you had said, were to drop the former part of the sentence, and accuse you of saying, "It is a shame to hang a poor fellow for house-breaking." This, though true *in words*, would be shamefully false *in meaning*; and yet, even this would not be more base and detestable, than the publication, of which I have spoken above, and which the public robbers are circulating, at such an immense expence, all over the kingdom, and particularly in this county. They have sent hundreds and thousands of copies into Hampshire. All the gentlemen, who signed the last Requisition, have received them for nothing. The post-office at Winchester has charged only a penny for their transmission to Twyford, for instance. The robbers, as they have came down from London in their carriages, have brought with them whole bales, which they have tossed out to all whom they met or overtook upon the road. A few days ago, a landau full of *he* and *she* speculators passed through Alton, tossing out these pamphlets as they went. The thing has been put into all the Inns, and other public places, particularly in Winchester, where it would certainly be put into the churches, if they were places of much resort; for, the Winchester Clergy appear to be perfectly convinced, that the way to prove that their brother, Dr. O'MEARA, did nothing that was wrong, is to abuse me; that the way to whitewash the church, is to cover me over with dirt.

Now, then, *what is this publication*, upon which the fool-knaves rely for the demolition of my character? It consists of certain documents, relating to the aforementioned Court-Martial, and, as I shall show you by-and-by, these documents, as they stand in this publication, present to the Reader a tissue of the vilest falsehoods. But, first I must give something of a history of the Court-Martial itself.—Late in the year 1791, I returned to England with my regiment, which landed at Portsmouth in the month of November. Very soon after that, I, being then the Serjeant

Major of the regiment, asked for my discharge, which, after many efforts, on the part of the commanding officer, Major Lord Edward Fitzgerald, and of General Frederick, the Colonel of the regiment, to prevail on me to remain (upon a promise of being specially recommended to the king, as worthy of being immediately promoted to the rank of Ensign) I obtained in the following words:

"By the right hon. major lord Edward Fitzgerald, commanding his Majesty's 54th Regiment of Foot, whereof lieut. gen. Frederick is colonel.—These are to certify, that the bearer hereof, WILLIAM COBBETT, Serjeant Major in the aforesaid regiment, has served honestly and faithfully for the space of eight years, nearly seven of which he has been a non-commissioned officer, and of that time he has been five years Serjeant Major to the regiment; but having very earnestly applied for his discharge, he, in consideration of his good behaviour, and the services he has rendered the regiment, is hereby discharged.—Given under my hand and the seal of the regiment, at Portsmouth, this 19th day of December, 1791.

EDWARD FITZGERALD."

"Portsmouth, 19th Dec. 1791.—Serjeant Major Cobbett having most pressingly applied for his discharge, at major lord Edw. Fitzgerald's request, general Frederick has granted it. General Frederick has ordered major lord Edw. Fitzgerald to return the Serjeant Major thanks for his behaviour and conduct during the time of his being in the regiment, and major lord Edward adds his most hearty thanks to those of the General."

The object of my thus quitting the army, to which I was, perhaps, more attached than any man that ever lived in the world; was, to bring certain officers to justice for having, in various ways, *wronged both the public and the soldier*. With this object in view, I went strait to London, the moment I had obtained my liberty and secured my *personal safety*, which, as you will readily conceive, would not have been the case if I had not first got my discharge.—I must here go back a little, and give an account of the measures, which, while in the regiment, I had taken, preparatory to this prosecution; and, in order to give the reader a full view of all the circumstances; in order that he may be able to form a just opinion of what I was in the army, I will give

him a short account of my progress.—I enlisted at Chatham in 1784; I joined the regiment, in Nova Scotia, in 1785; I was almost immediately made a Corporal; in a few months afterwards I was made a Serjeant; and, at the end of about a year and a half, I was made the Serjeant Major.—While I was a corporal I was made *clerk* to the regiment. In a very short time, the whole of the business, in that way, fell into my hands; and, at the end of about a year, neither adjutant, pay-master, or quarter-master, could move an inch without my assistance. The military part of the regiment's affairs fell under my care in like manner. About this time, the new *discipline*, as it was called; that is to say, the mode of handling the musket, and of marching, &c. called “Dundas's System,” was sent out to us, in little books, which were to be studied by the officers of each regiment, and the rules of which were to be immediately conformed to.—Though any old woman might have written such a book; though it was excessively foolish, from beginning to end; still, it was to be complied with; it ordered and commanded a *total change*, and this change was to be completed before the next annual review took place.

To make this change was left to me, who was not then twenty years of age, while not a single officer in the regiment paid the least attention to the matter; so, that when the time came for the annual review, I, then a *corporal*, had to give lectures of instruction to the officers themselves, the colonel not excepted; and, for several of them, if not for all of them, I had to make out, upon large cards, which they bought for the purpose, little plans of the position of the regiment, together with lists of the words of command, which they had to give in the field.—Is it any wonder, that we experience *defeats*? There was I, at the review, upon the flank of the Grenadier Company, with my worsted shoulder-knot, and my great, high, coarse, hairy cap; confounded in the ranks amongst other men, while those who were commanding me to move my hands or my feet, thus or thus, were, in fact, uttering words, which I had taught them; and were, in every thing excepting mere authority, my inferiors; and ought to have been commanded by me.—It was impossible for reflections of this sort not to intrude themselves; and, as I advanced in experience, I felt less and less respect for those, whom I was compelled to obey. One suffers injustice from men, of great endow-

ments of mind, with much less of heart-burning than from men, whom one cannot help despising; and, if my officers had been men of manifest superiority of mind, I should, perhaps, not have so soon conceived the project of bringing them, or some of them, at least, to shame and punishment for the divers flagrant breaches of the law, committed by them, and for their manifold, their endless, wrongs against the soldiers and against the public.—This project was conceived so early as the year 1787, when an affair happened, that first gave me a full insight into regimental justice. It was shortly this: that the Quarter Master, who had the issuing of the men's provisions to them, *kept about a fourth part of it to himself*. This, the old serjeants told me, had been the case *for many years*; and, they were quite astonished and terrified at the idea of my complaining of it. This I did, however; but, the reception I met with convinced me, that I must never make another complaint, 'till I got safe to England, and safe out of the reach of that most curious of courts, a *Court Martial*.—From this time forward, I began to collect materials for an exposure, upon my return to England. I had ample opportunities for this, being the keeper of all the books, of every sort, in the regiment, and knowing the whole of its affairs better than any other man. But, the winter previous to our return to England, I thought it necessary to make extracts from books, lest the books themselves should be destroyed. And, here begins the history of the famous *Court Martial*. In order to be able to prove that these extracts were correct, it was necessary that I should have a *witness* as to their being *true copies*. This was a very ticklish point. One foolish step here, wou'd have sent me down to the ranks with a pair of bloody shoulders. Yet, it was necessary to have the witness. I hesitated many months. At one time, I had given the thing up. I dreamt twenty times, I dare say, of my papers being discovered, and of my being tried and flogged half to death. At last, however, some fresh act of injustice towards us made me set all danger at defiance. I opened my project to a corporal, whose name was *William Bestland*, who wrote in the office under me, who was a very honest fellow, who was very much bound to me, for my goodness to him, and who was, with the sole exception of myself, the only sober man in the *whole regiment*.—To work we went, and during a long winter, while the

rest were boozing and snoring, we gutted no small part of the regimental books, rolls, and other documents. Our way was this: to take a copy, sign it with our names, and clap the regimental seal to it, so that we might be able to swear to it, when produced in court.—All these papers were put into a little box, which I myself had made for the purpose. When we came to Portsmouth, there was a talk of searching all the boxes, &c. which gave us great alarm; and induced us to take out all the papers, put them in a bag, and trust them to a custom-house officer, who conveyed them on shore, to his own house, whence I removed them in a few days after.

Thus prepared, I went to London, and, on the 14th of January, 1792, I wrote to the then Secretary at War, Sir GEORGE YONGE, stating my situation, my business with him, and my intentions; enclosing him a letter or petition, from myself to the king, stating the substance of all the complaints I had to make; and which letter I requested Sir George Yonge to lay before the king.—I waited from the 14th to the 24th of January, without receiving any answer at all, and then all I heard was, that he wished to see me at the war-office. At the war-office I was shown into an anti-chamber amongst numerous anxious-looking men, who, every time the door, which led to the great man, was opened, turned their eyes that way with a motion as regular and as uniform as if they had been drilled to it. These people eyed me from head to foot, and I never shall forget their look, when they saw, that I was admitted into Paradise without being detained a single minute in Purgatory.—Sir George Yonge heard my story; and that was apparently all he wanted of me. I was to hear from him again in a day or two; and, after waiting for fifteen days, without hearing from him, or any one else, upon the subject, I wrote to him again, reminding him, that I had, from the first, told him, that I had no other business in London; that my stock of money was necessarily scanty; and, that to detain me in London was to ruin me. Indeed, I had, in the whole world, but about 200 guineas, which was a great deal for a person in my situation to have saved. Every week in London, especially as, by way of episode, I had now married, took, at least, a couple of guineas from my stock. I, therefore, began to be very impatient, and, indeed, to be very suspicious, that military justice in England was pretty nearly a-kn

military justice in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.—The letter I now wrote was dated on the 10th of February, to which I got an answer on the 15th, though the answer might have been written in a moment.—I was, in this answer, informed, that it was the intention to try the accused upon *only part of the charges* which I had preferred; and, from a new-modelled list of charges, sent me by the Judge Advocate, on the 23rd of February, it appeared, that, even of those charges that were suffered to remain, *the parts the most material were omitted*. But, this was not all. I had all along insisted, that, unless the Court-Martial were held in London, I could not think of appearing at it; because, if held in a garrisoned place like Portsmouth, the thing must be a mere mockery. In spite of this, however, the Judge Advocate's letter of the 23rd of February informed me, that the Court was to be held at Portsmouth, or Hilsea. I remonstrated against this, and demanded that my remonstrance should be laid before the king, which, on the 29th the Judge Advocate promised should be done by himself; but, on the 5th of March, the Judge Advocate informed me, that he had laid my remonstrance before . . . whom, think you? Not the king, but the accused parties; who, of course, thought the court ought to assemble at Portsmouth or Hilsea, and, doubtless for the very very reasons that led me to object to its being held there.

Plainly seeing what was going forward, I, on the 7th of March, made, in a letter to Mr. Pitt, a representation of the whole case, giving him a history of the obstacles I had met with, which letter concluded thus: “I have now, Sir, done all a man can do in such a case. I have proceeded regularly, and, I may add, respectfully, from first to last: if I am allowed to serve my country by prosecuting men, who have injured it, I shall do it: if I am thwarted and pressed down by those, whose office it is to assist and support me, I cannot do it: in either case, I shall be satisfied with having done my duty, and shall leave the world to make a comparison between me and the men whom I have accused.”—This letter (which, by-the-by, the public robbers have not published) had the effect of changing the place of the Court-martial, which was now to be held in London; but, as to my other great ground of complaint, the leaving of the *regimental books unsecured*, it had no effect at all; and, it

will be recollect, that, without those books, there could be, as to most of the weighty charges, no proof produced, without bringing forward Corporal Bestland, and the danger of doing that will be presently seen.—But, now, mark well as to these books; as to this great source of that sort of evidence, which was not to be brow-beaten, or stifled by the dangers of the lash. Mark well, these facts, and from them judge of what I had to expect in the way of justice.—On the 22nd of January, I wrote to Sir George Yonge for the express purpose of having the books secured; that is to say, taken out of the hands, and put out of the reach, of the parties accused. On the 24th of January, he told me, that HE HAD taken care to give directions to have these documents secured. On the 18th of February, in answer to a letter, in which I (upon information received from the regiment) complained of the documents not having been secured, he wrote to me, and I have now the letter before me, signed with his own hand, that he would write to the Colonel of the regiment about the books, &c. “Although,” says he, “I cannot doubt but that the regimental books have been properly secured.” This was on the 18th of February, mind; and, now it appears, from the documents, which the public-robbers have put forth, that the first time any order for securing the books was given, was on the 15th of March, though the Secretary told me he had done it on the 24th of January, and repeated his assertion in writing, on the 18th of February. There is quite enough in this fact alone to shew the public what sort of a chance I stood of obtaining justice.

Without these written documents nothing of importance could be proved, unless the non-commissioned officers and men of the regiment should happen to get the better of their dread of the lash; and, even then, they could only speak from memory. All, therefore, depended upon those written documents, as to the principal charges. Therefore, as the Court-martial was to assemble on the 24th of March, I went down to Portsmouth on the 20th, in order to know for certain what was become of the books; and, I found, as, indeed, I suspected was the case, that they had never been secured at all; that they had been left in the hands of the accused from the 14th of January to the very hour of trial; and that, in short, my request, as to this point, the positive condition as to this most important matter,

had been totally disregarded.—There remained, then, nothing to rest upon with safety but our extracts, confirmed by the evidence of *Bestland*, the corporal, who had signed them along with me; and this I had solemnly engaged with him not to have recourse to, unless he was first out of the army; that is to say, out of the reach of the vindictive and bloody lash. He was a very little fellow: not more than about five feet high; and had been set down to be discharged when he went to England; but, there was a suspicion of his connection with me, and, therefore, they resolved to keep him. It would have been cruel, and even perfidious, to have brought him forward under such circumstances; and, as there was no chance of doing any thing without him, I resolved not to appear at the Court-martial, unless the discharge of Bestland was first granted. Accordingly, on the 20th of March, I wrote, from Fratton, a village near Portsmouth, to the Judge Advocate, stating over again all the obstacles that had been thrown in my way, complaining particularly that the books and documents had been left in possession of the accused, contrary to my urgent request and to the positive assurances of the Secretary at War, and concluding by demanding the discharge of a man, whom I should name, as the only condition upon which I would attend the Court-martial. I requested him to send me an answer by the next day, at night, at my former lodgings; and told him, that, unless such answer was received, he and those to whom my repeated applications had been made, might do what they pleased with their Court-martial; for, that I confidently trusted, that a few days would place me beyond the scope of their power.—No answer came, and, as I had learned, in the meanwhile, that there was a design to prosecute me for *sedition*, that was an additional motive to be quick in my movements. As I was going down to Portsmouth, I met several of the serjeants coming up, together with the music-master; and, as they had none of them been in America, I wondered what they could be going to London for; but, upon my return, I was told by a Capt. Lane, who had been in the regiment, that they had been brought up to swear, that, at an entertainment given to them by me before my departure from the regiment, I had drunk “*the destruction of the House of Brunswick*.” This was false; but, I knew that that was no reason why it should not be sworn by such per-

sons and in such a case. I had talked pretty freely, upon the occasion alluded to; but I had neither said, nor thought any thing against the king, and, as to the *House of Brunswick*, I hardly knew what it meant. My head was filled with the corruptions and the baseness in the army. I knew nothing at all about politics. Nor would any threat of this sort have induced me to get out of the way for a moment; though it certainly would, if I had known my danger; for glorious "Jacobinical" times were just then beginning. Of this, however, I knew nothing at all. I did not know what the *Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act* meant. When you have a mind to do a thing, every trifle is an additional motive. Lane, who had enlisted me, and who had always shown great kindness towards me, told me they would send me to Botany Bay; and, I now verily believe, that, if I had remained, I should have furnished a pretty good example to those, who wished to correct military abuses. I did not, however, leave England from this motive. I could not obtain a chance of success, without exposing the back of my poor faithful friend Bestland, which, had I not pledged myself not to do, I would not have done. It was useless to appear, unless I could have tolerable fair play; and, besides, it seemed better to leave the whole set to do as they pleased, than to be made a mortified witness of what it was quite evident they had resolved to do.

Such is the *true* history of this affair, which, had the public robbers given it as it stood, unmitigated, not a word should I ever have published by way of defence, or explanation. At the time when I was writing against Pitt and Melville, the Robbers then talked of exposing me with the account of this transaction, which I never wished, nor had any reason to wish, to keep a secret, and which I then called upon them to make known to the world. "There is," said I, "nothing that I should like better, than your publishing the *whole* of the documents relating to that affair. You have not only my free leave to do it; but my request to do it." — They knew better. They knew, that, with whomsoever should read *all* those documents, I could not fail to rise in esteem; because they proved me to have been, in all times of my life, an enemy to public-robbers, whether on a great or a small scale. — Mark what these robbers have now done. The intelligent reader will easily find out, who the robbers are; and

I beg him to mark how they have acted in this instance.—Of TWENTY SEVEN Letters, written by me, these miscreants have published FIVE, and those of the least importance. My petition, in the form of a letter, to the King; my letter to Mr. Pitt, as long as one half of all the rest; my last letter to the Judge Advocate; all my letters to the Secretary at War; all the *Charges*, occupying the space of several pages: all these are suppressed, and with them, all the grounds and motives of my coming forward; all the remonstrances that I made against the discouragement I met with; all the conditions, upon which I pledged myself to prove guilt; and, finally, all the reasons which I gave for not appearing, when those conditions had been violated.—This is the way, is it, that these public-robbers make use of documents, which are committed to their hands? This is their "honourable" conduct, is it? And these are the publications, are they, that the Clergy at Winchester circulate gratis?—When I first saw the Affair of the Court-Martial advertised, I was at the house of a friend, and upon his showing me the advertisement, I said, "now, if the rascals do but publish *all* my letters, what honour they will do me!" They took care not to do that. They dared not do that: the facts and the sentiments therein contained would be found to cut too close: and, besides, those letters, if all published complete, would do me so much honour: the reader of them would, at every sentence, exclaim: "here were the same mind and the same principles, that we find in him at the present day." — There are not, I am fully persuaded, in any country, such mean and dirty wretches as our public robbers. Buonaparté has nothing in his dominions that is not manly and dignified, compared to our gang. He may have people, who would lend a man a sly blow in the dark, if they found him too hard for them with his pen; but, I do not think, that there is, in all Europe, not even amongst the Sicilians or Portuguese, a set of creatures so mean and despicable in their spite as our public-robbers; a set of "tame cheaters;" the poison of asps is under their lips, but they want the courage even of a worm.—One would wonder where they would find the assurance to *face* me, or to face the public, after having suppressed these twenty-two letters. Why, the truth is, they dare not face me, or any body else. They dare look no part of the public in the face. They skulk from the

light. Not a man of them dares put his name to the publication, upon which I have been remarking. They are conscious of their villainous deeds: they feel, even now, the dread of that punishment, which their manifold robberies so richly merit: they feel that they are not safe while my pen is in action. This inspires them with deadly hatred; and that hatred urges them on to that mixture of malignity and folly visible in this their last production.

The object of the Pamphlet, which the public-robbers have so industriously circulated, is to cause it to be believed, that I brought a *false* accusation against the parties; that I knew it to be false, and that, when the hour of trial came, I *skulked* away. But, what sense would there have been in such a proceeding? What motive could I have had for doing a thing so very silly? Can it be believed, that I would have put myself to the expence of a two or three months living in London, when my circumstances so loudly called me away, and that I would have taken the pains to write twenty seven letters, and to dance attendance as many times at the Horse Guards? Can it be believed, that I, who was capable of writing these letters, and who was so well acquainted with the law as well as the facts of the case? Can it be believed, that I should have put myself to all this trouble and expence, merely for the purpose of bringing a parcel of officers and soldiers to London and making fools of them?—Besides, if this had been the case, how comes it, that I have remained in England now, for *nine years*, and have never been called upon by any of the accused parties to unsay, what I said of them in 1792. True, it is now so long as *seventeen* years since the charges were preferred; but, it was only *eight* years, when I returned to England. If, therefore, either the parties or the government had had any reason to complain of me, why did they not do it immediately upon my return? They knew very well where I was. They could not help knowing it. Nay, they knew where I was and all about me *while I was in America*, where I published an account of my having been the Serjeant Major of the 54th regiment, and of my having left it in such a year. The pamphlet, in which this was stated, was published in England, in 1796, only *four* years after the Court-Martial was held; it was published, too, at the express desire of Mr. Canning, who was then an under Secretary of State in Pitt's ministry. This being the case, would not the parties, if they had really

felt themselves wronged by me; if they had really wished to be confronted with me; would not they, even while I was in America, have found the means of charging me with having made a false accusation against them? Would they, under such circumstances, have suffered me to rest in quiet. And, the government too, who, in the Case drawn up for the opinion of the Attorney and Solicitor General, said I had *deceived the crown*; the government, who appeared to be so angry at me for having made a "*mockery of justice*"; how came the government not to call upon me, when, *nine years ago*, I returned to England? They all talked very big when they found me safe gone; but, none of them thought proper to challenge me to the proof when I came back. The history of the transaction, drawn up to be laid before the then Attorney and Solicitor General, was *false*. It kept out of sight the circumstance of *three fourths of my Charges having been suppressed*, and the still more important circumstance of *the regimental books and papers not having been secured*, according to my desire, so often and so earnestly expressed. If these facts had been related to sir John Scott and sir John Mitford; if they had had all my twenty-seven letters before them, their opinion would have been very different from what it was. They would, indeed, have seen, that it was those, who had thrown obstacles in my way, who had been guilty of "*deceiving the crown and making a mockery of justice*." But, at any rate, if the parties had really thought they had grounds of actions against me, how came they not to bring those actions, when I returned to England, nine years ago; especially as it would have afforded them so charming an opportunity of vindicating their own character, and fixing an everlasting stigma upon that of their accuser, whom they must necessarily hate, and of course, wish to expose and to punish? How came they not to bring those actions? How came both they and the government to remain so quiet?—The fact is, they all knew my charges to be true; they were all glad that the matter was got over so quietly; they had not the smallest desire to stir the coals again; and, it is that state of desperation, in which the public robbers now are, that has induced them to resort to this old transaction, in the hope of framing a charge against me, which, owing to the long lapse of time, I should find it difficult completely to refute.

These robbers, particularly those of

them who curse the county of Hants with their presence or interference, endeavour to represent me as a *low* person; a person of no consequence; a person by whom the county ought to be ashamed to be *led*.

—In the first place, I have not the presumption to wish to *lead* the county, though I have a very strong desire to assist in asserting its honour and independence; to assist in rescuing its property from the fangs of public-robbers, and its people from the intolerable disgrace of being the tools of a set of tax-gatherers and political priests.—In the next place, as to being a *low* person, I never, in point of *birth*, pretend to be a *high* one; I never put on any airs; I never attempt to dictate at any public-meeting; I never shun any man on account of his poverty, or low rank in life; I am not a seeker after the nobility and those who call themselves great men. Therefore, any reproach of this sort does not apply to me.—But, as to being *low* in point of *character*, or in point of *weight as a public man*, I am persuaded, that there are very few persons, who will not laugh at the idea, especially when endeavoured to be inculcated by those very robbers, whom, it is notorious, I make tremble for their cheese, and who are more afraid of me than ever rat was afraid of a terrier.—I am, and always have been, for paying respect to rank and title, even to mere *birth*, unaccompanied with any other consideration; because, such distinction in society appears to me to be productive of many good effects, which I need not now dwell upon. But, I think, there can be no question, that great endowments of the mind, without any of the circumstances of title or family, must, if properly used, be considered as giving the possessor an elevated place in society. Why are Clergymen, Medical men, and Lawyers, considered as *gentlemen*? Not because they are persons of high birth; for many of them, and especially the Clergy, are bred at charity schools; but, because their profession argues them to possess considerable mental endowments. In short, as it is *mind* alone which raises man above the brutes and gives him the command of them; so it is superiority of mind that raises one man above another, and gives him, in one way or another, more or less of command over him.—Therefore, when the Poulters and the parson Woodcocks and the Mr. Portals cry out, “what a shame it is for ‘the County to be led by Cobbett,’” the county has only to ask, whether I appear to have more or less *mind* than the Poulters and the parson Woodcocks and the Mr. Portals.

That is the only question: not whether I have more or less of *land*, but whether I have more or less of *mind*; and then, whether I have more or less of *truth* on my side, than they have on theirs. These are the questions for the county to ask; and, if it were disposed to put one more question, it might be this: which has most merit; which has shewn the greatest capacity; which is, on account of his acquirements, whether of mind or of property, entitled to the greatest respect, Mr. Poulter, who owes all he possesses to the luck of having a Bishop for a brother-in-law; or, Mr. Cobbett, who owes all he possesses to his own talents and industry?

But, Gentlemen, this attempt to represent me as a *low* and *insignificant* person, besides the folly of it, is an instance of *hypocrisy* well worthy of notice. There is scarcely a man amongst those who now appear to be united together for the purpose of *decrying* me, who has not, upon some occasion or other, paid his court to me, sought my acquaintance, asked of me something or other, either for himself or for some relation or friend. I was told, a few weeks ago, that DENT, a member of parliament, should say, that he wondered the *gentlemen* in Hampshire did not *put me down*. Why, this DENT is one of the scores of such men, whom I have shut my door against. He wanted to introduce himself to me, while I lived in Duke Street, Westminster, which I absolutely would not permit him to do. He called several times, and sent me up very respectful messages, till, at last, the servant had orders to tell him, that I would not see him. I did not like DENT, and I would not be acquainted with him. I have mentioned him in particular here, because I recollect, that Mr. Windham was in my study one of the times when he sent up his card; and yet this man has now the assurance to talk of me as a *low* person, who ought to have nothing to say in a county!—I do not like to say so much of myself; but, to do it this once appears due to the *cause*, if not to myself. And, I think, I may venture to say, that the lives of very few men have been marked with stronger proofs of merit of every sort. In my regiment I was every thing: the whole corps was under my controul: I rendered services, not only in the regiment, but in the provinces where we were stationed, such as no one but myself would have thought of. I remember a set of

*Commissioners* being sent out from England, a part of whose business it was to make a statement and report of the population, &c. &c. of the province. They lived about our quarters for some time; they had some jovial carousings with our officers; but, *it was I* who made out their statement, and *drew up their report* to be sent home to the king; for which, by the bye, they never gave me even their thanks. This statement, which, as was the case with every thing that I meddled with, was done in so clear, correct, and, in point of penmanship, so beautiful a manner, that, I have been told, the duke of Kent, when he afterwards became Commander-in-Chief in those provinces, had it copied; and took away the original as a curiosity. This was the way in which I did every thing. I was, of course, very much envied and hated by the weak and the wicked, and, as was natural to expect, I did not, amongst people, whom, though my superiors in rank, I could not help despising, bear myself with much moderation. From nineteen to twenty-seven is not much of an age for moderation, especially with those, who must necessarily despise all around them. But, the fame of my services and talents ran through the whole country. Every good man respected me. I was invited to visit people in all parts of the provinces. While we lay at Fredericton in New Brunswick, I had the settling, or rather the preventing, of eight or nine law-suits. I had the affairs of a whole regiment to attend to; all its accounts, its parades, its guards, its every thing. I found, however, time for studying English and French grammar; I learnt geometry and fortification; I built a barrack for four hundred men, without the aid of either draughtsman, carpenter, or bricklayer, the soldiers under me cut down the timber and dug the stones, and I was the architect; I went through a tract of woods, of above a hundred miles, where no man had ever ventured before to go alone; and this I did for the purpose of putting a stop to desertion, by showing the regiment that I *myself* was able to follow the fugitives, and, accordingly, after that we had no more desertion to the United States. With all these occupations (of which I mention only a few particulars that occur to me at the moment) I found time for skating, fishing, shooting, and all the other sports of the country, of which, when I left it, I had seen, and knew, more than any other man. There is some little difference, I think, between

such a man as I and such a man as Mr. Poulter! I might, surely, say to him as VOLTAIRE said to the monk: "Yes, yes, "no doubt, you are *a man*, as well as I; "but, my friend, there are *two sorts* of "men."—Why, I *always* had weight and power. Wherever I was, I was a *leader*, and, would it not be a base abandonment of the claims which nature and habit have given me, to pretend that I am nothing more than such a man, for instance, as parson Woodcock, whose mental endowments are discovered in his turning off those of his tradesmen, who signed the Requisition for a county meeting to thank Mr. Wardle!

I cannot help again reverting to this newly-thought-of scheme of representing me as a *low* and *insignificant* person.—As a proof of the estimation, in which I was held, while in the army, I will mention, that, about four years ago, General Carleton, brother of the late Lord Dorchester, and now Lord Dorchester himself I believe, *came to my house to see me*, and to remind me, that he had the pleasure of knowing me in New Brunswick. He was Governor of the province of New Brunswick, while my regiment was stationed there. He was our reviewing General, and he knew me, my character and services, well. He had, however, never known me in any other capacity than that of Serjeant Major; and *Generals* are not much in the habit of going to see Serjeants Major, unless there be something very particular about them. This gentleman had been governor, upon the very spot where I was with my regiment for four years; and, his visit to me, in England, was, it will be observed, after my return from America the *last time*, after the affair of the Court Martial of course; and of that affair he must have been well acquainted with all the circumstances, seeing that his own name, as a reviewing general, who had been imposed upon by a false return, was mentioned in one of the Charges. His visit to me was a pretty good proof, that he had perceived nothing dishonorable in my conduct.—But, this is, altogether the foolishest charge that even the robbers ever invented.—Why, on my return from America, having stopped at Halifax in Nova Scotia, the Duke of Kent, who requested to see me, talked to me about my regiment and about all its affairs. He must have known all about the Court-Martial. Mr. Windham and Mr. Yorke have been, since my return, and the former was before, *Secre-*

*taries at War*; they had the whole history in their office; and yet nobody in the country has ever spoken, and, I believe, thought, better of me, than Mr. Windham and Mr. Yorke have. I remember, that in dining with Mr. Pitt, at Mr. Windham's in August 1800, the former asked me about *Lord Edward Fitzgerald*. We talked about him a good deal. I gave the company present (of which Mr. Canning was one) an account of his conduct, while at the regiment; I spoke in very high terms of his zeal for the service, and I told Mr. Pitt, that Lord Edward was the only sober and the only *honest* officer, I had ever known in the army. I did this for the express purpose of leading him on to talk about the Court-Martial; but, it was avoided. In fact, they all well knew that what I had complained of was true, and that I had been baffled in my attempts to obtain justice, only because I had neither money nor friends. The same is known to those, who now are publishing and circulating this false account of that transaction; but, what they have in view, is not truth; it is, in short, to preserve their plunder, which they think is in imminent danger, unless they can destroy my credit with the public.

They naturally hate me. They have abundant reason so to do; but, of late, their hatred must have received fresh supplies. Many of the gentlemen connected with the press have dealt the robbers some deadly blows; but, from the nature of my publication; from my being able to devote the *whole* of my pages to the thing, I have certainly hit them harder than any body else, and the measure of their hatred is accordingly. It is true, that one would imagine, that nobody could be so foolish as not to see, that, when detected in such shameful garbling as to suppress 22 out of 27 documents, and especially to suppress *every* document, upon which the real merits of the case turned; one would imagine, that even the Poulterers would have been able to tell the compilers, that a publication like this must defeat its own purpose, and that, in the end, in place of injuring me, it must do me a great deal of good. But, the truth is, that in such circumstances, men's minds are shut against all reasoning. Detected in their robberies, they jump from the roof. They break their necks on the pavement, in order to save them from the halter.

The purpose, at present, of all the public robbers, of every description, is to pre-

vent the success of our endeavours to bring about a *Reform in the House of Commons*; for, unless they can effect that; unless they can prevent such a Reform from taking place, they must experience such a change as will compel them to *earn their livings honestly*, or live *upon their own means*; and, this is what they appear resolved not to do, if they can avoid it. Mr. Wardle has pledged himself to prove, that a Reform in the House of Commons would render the *Income Tax unnecessary*; and, I, who have considered every part of the subject with great attention, and who am acquainted with every branch of revenue as well as of expenditure, am not only convinced, that this saving could and would be made; but, that a *much greater* saving would be made, and without any injury whatever to any part of the public service, while it must be manifest, that such saving would prevent, in a considerable degree, the further depreciation in the value of funded property. All this the whole gang of public robbers deny; flatly deny. Here, then, is a great question to be decided; and, as I have taken a leading part in the discussion, the robbers, as to a desperate remedy, have been driven to personal attacks upon me. For the sake of the *cause*, therefore, it became necessary for me to show how base, how detestable, are the conduct and the evident motives of our enemies. Those who publish these things against me, know well how false they are; but, it is when they affect to consider me as a *low* and *insignificant* person; it is then that they are the greatest hypocrites. I could mention, if I were to take a day or two to consider, a thousand instances, in which persons, who are *enemies to Parliamentary Reform*, and who are considered as *great men*, have availed themselves, or endeavoured to avail themselves of my support. But, there is one instance, which now occurs to me, and which, under the present circumstances, I cannot refrain from stating.—Each of you, Gentlemen, will probably recollect, that, much about this time of the year, six years ago; that is to say, in the summer of 1803, at a time when there was a general fear of *invasion*, a publication was issued by the government, was sent to all the parishes, was distributed in the churches, and was read from the several pulpits. This paper was entitled: “*IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE PEOPLE OF THIS KINGDOM:*” It was, in the news-papers, attributed to *LORD HAWKESBURY*; afterwards to *Dr. HORSLEY*, *Dr. RENNELL*, and other learned and elo-

quent men; but, the real author of it was *myself*. I wrote it; offered it to Mr. Addington, through Mr. Yorke; he accepted of it, in which he showed his sense of duty to be above party pique; and, it was published and distributed at the expence of several thousands of pounds. Now, though the Reverend Messrs. Poulter and Woodcock may be ready to bite their tongues upon reflecting, that they once read, even from the pulpit, a production of mine, that will not do away the fact.—They would fain represent me as a *low* and *insignificant* person; but, let them efface, if they can, the fact, that a production of mine, when its author was unknown, was, by the periodical publications of the day; aye, by that *Morning Post* and that *Courier*, which now abuse me, ascribed to *Dr. Horsley* first, and then to *Dr. Rennell*; and, that this publication was sent to every parish throughout the kingdom, under government authority and at the *public expence*. When Mr. Poulter or Mr. Woodcock or Mr. Portal, or any of those, who attempt to lower me in the estimation of the people of this county; when any of them shall have produced any thing to be so honoured as this production of mine, and shall have refused, as I did, to take any compensation for it; when they shall have given such irrefragable proofs of ability, public-spirit, and disinterestedness, then let them pretend to place themselves upon an equal footing with me; but not before; 'till then, let them keep their due, that is to say, an inferior place. In every way in which we can be compared, except as to mere money, I am *their superior*; and that, you may be assured, Gentlemen, I will not, if they persevere in their opposition to our laudable undertaking, and if I have my life and health, fail to make them *feel*.—I have, in spite of all provocation, abstained from stating this anecdote to the public, for six years; nor should I have mentioned it now on my own account; but, seeing that the *cause* is to be attacked through *me*, it is necessary for me to take care to guard the channel. The cause of Reform has been, and studiously is, identified with my reputation; therefore, it is necessary for me to shew that those are the vilest of hypocrites and calumniators, who attack that reputation. The King, I was well informed, expressed the highest approbation of the work I have been speaking of. He was not, I dare say, told who was the author, nor was it necessary that he should be; for I wanted nothing of him by way of reward, no not even a "*thank you.*" But,

I must confess, that, *now* I do think, the King owes me something; and thus, I humbly conceive, he ought to pay me: He ought, I think, to order his ministers to cause this Letter to be circulated, in the same way that the little Pamphlet was; or, which I should prefer, to order them to circulate, in that manner, my next Letter upon the subject of *Parliamentary Reform*. The little Pamphlet did, I verily believe, produce more effect, in this country, than had been produced by all other publications put together for years before. There are about eleven thousand Clergymen in England and Wales, and my real belief is, that all of them together, in the whole of the preceding eleven years, had not, whether by writing or preaching, moved the people so much as I moved them in one single week. I trust, therefore, that His Majesty will be pleased to give his sanction to the circulating of one of my Letters. I should, I think, prefer the next Letter upon Parliamentary Reform. I will certainly make the application, in a proper way; and, if the King follows his own opinion, he will, I am certain, grant my request.

I have now, Gentlemen, to apologize for the length of this Letter. I could not curtail it, without leaving out something material; and yet, I am aware, that it may be thought more, than any man, under any circumstances, ought to say of himself. Had it not been for the *public* cause, not a word should any of these vile attacks have drawn from me. What I have done seemed to be due to my *friends*, private as well as political; because, those who wou'd be silent to my face, would not scruple to taunt them. I must, however, express my earnest hope, that no friend of mine will, *in future*, expect of me, that I waste any part of my time or paper in the answering of personal attacks. At any rate, I am resolved not to do it; unless by barely stating, in a short sentence, that such or such a thing is *true*, or is *false*. There will be thousands of lies against me; but that is what I have to expect; and, really, the good opinion is worth but little of that man, who can lend an ear to the assertions of wretches, who, in pretending to give a true history of a transaction, could suppress twenty-two documents out of twenty-seven, and insert only such as tended to throw no light at all upon the merits of the case. After this instance of falsehood, baseness, meanness, and dirtiness, on the part of my assailants, no one can think it necessary

for me to answer any of their future attacks, except by a mere affirmation or negation; such, therefore, is all the answer, they shall, in future, receive.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your friend,

W<sup>M</sup>. COBBETT.

*Botley, 14 June, 1809.*

### PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

On Thursday, the 15th instant, SIR FRANCIS BURDETT made, in the House of Commons, a Speech, upon the important subject of PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.—

This Speech, which I have taken care to have as full and correct as possible, I shall in my next communicate to the public, and for that purpose shall make it a *double sheet*, instead of the one that would, in the usual course, appear on the 15th of July.—Here we have what Sir Francis Burdett wishes for, and what he does not wish for. He has long been taunted with not knowing what he wanted; but that taunt will now, surely, cease to be used. We shall now hear what his opponents have to say against his propositions; though, I imagine, they will be found to have little to say, except in the way of abuse.—For my part, I think the thing so completely correspondent with the principles of the Constitution of England; so strictly in adherence with the spirit of Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, and the Act of Settlement; so simple in its provisions; so easy in its execution; and yet so mighty in its means of real Reformation, that I can scarcely bring myself to believe, that there is one man in the whole kingdom, who, in his heart, can disapprove of it.—Where are now all the predictions about the “wild projects; the enthusiastic schemes.” Here is nothing to terrify any body; but

enough to quiet every body. Pass a bill to this effect, and you need not fear Buonaparté’s gun-boats.

### SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

AUSTRIA.—The “*good news*,” as it is called, from the Danube, will, I am of opinion, be of very short duration. We do pretty well in the gazette-making way, but the Austrians beat us. I think, it is very evident, that, owing to the unforeseen destruction of a bridge across the Danube, the French were checked in their career of victory; but, I can perceive not the smallest reason to suppose, that their career will be long checked, especially when I see them still in possession of Vienna, and of every inch of ground they had gained, and see two fresh armies coming up to back and assist them. One thing, however, our allies will have achieved to a certainty; and that is, *the extracting of a good lumping sum of money out of the pockets of the people of this kingdom.* The “*brilliant victory* of the Archduke Charles;” this phrase, bandied about as it is, will, like the taylor’s compliments to the Bourgeois Gentilhomme, induce John Bull to draw his leathers, and that is precisely what the German wants. The drawing upon *us* for money, the moment he drew the sword; that was a pretty good proof of what we had to expect from the war. Be it what else it would, it was evident that it was to be a war upon our purses.—The insurrection, under SCHILL, in Germany, has, it seems been quelled by an army of *Dutch*, who, odd as it may appear, are both able and willing to fight under a Buonaparté, though they would not lift a sword, even in their own defence, under their Stadholder.—There is an idea, that, in the North of Germany, there is a spirit of insurrection against the *old system* as well as against Buonaparté. I was told of this some time ago; and, I see that the fact is much dwelt upon in a letter published in the Morning Chronicle of the 12th instant. The fact may be true; but, I am afraid no such insurrection could succeed at present; and, I beseech the writer of the letter alluded to, not to rely upon any assistance, in favour of such an enterprize, from the *English government*, as he appears to do. He says, we assist Spain: no, not Spain, but, as Messrs. INGLIS, CANNING, and Co. inform us from their tavern forum, we assist, or would assist, *Ferdinand the Seventh.* No:

this German is very much deceived, if he supposes, that Messrs. Perceval and Co. will give a single musket, or cartridge, for the purpose of making war against that *corruption*, of which he complains. They will give away our money for no such purpose, he may be assured; and, therefore, unless he finds the system of Buonaparté more oppressive than the old system, he will do well to advise his countrymen to keep quiet.—It is curious to observe the lofty encomiums passed upon this *insurrection*, by those of our public prints, which, in general, seem to view every thing, tending to insurrection, with the deepest horror. This German insurrection appears to hit their taste. They say, that its “career has been short, but *full of glory*,” and these sentiments they utter, while they are in the constant habit of tearing open the old sores in Ireland, and of representing all those, who were there suspected of a design to cause an insurrection, as the blackest of villains. Nay, it is not a week since the very paper, which laments the fall of SCHILL, and hangs the cypress, interwoven with the laurel, over his grave, took occasion to rake up the ashes of LORD EDWARD FITZGERALD, and to call him conspirator and traitor.—These gentlemen seem to like insurrections in other countries well enough. They would even assist the insurgents with arms and money; but, if they were to hear of France doing such a thing, they would make the firmament ring with the howlings of their horror. They would charge her with *perfidy* unheard of, and would, if necessary, take their oaths, that it was to these perfidious arts, and not to her valour, that she owed her successes.—I think, that the best way is for us to say but very little in favour of insurrections in other countries, lest it should induce some persons to make a mistake, and to suppose, that insurrections are just as lawful and as laudable in *this country* as they are in Germany; which mistake, though founded in very plausible reasoning, might prove fatal to those who should be so misled, and who, to their cost, would find, that what the hireling writers call *patriotism* in the Germans, they would call *treason* in the English or the Irish.

**SWEDEN.**—Our ally, the king of Sweden, has, it seems, abdicated his throne. His proclamation to this effect is a performance replete with just sentiments, and leading to a very natural and useful conclusion. He declares, that he can no longer fill the throne to the advantage and

honour of the nation, and that, therefore, he quits it, for the purpose of passing the remainder of his days, in the fear and worship of God, wishing that all his subjects may, in future, enjoy more happiness and prosperity than they enjoyed under him.

—Faith, a very sensible man! And a just man too. Yet, now, if any one had told him this, only a few months before, how quickly he would have been packed off to the gibbet! How many ugly names, such as conspirator, traitor, &c. he would have been called.—Here, this king himself confesses that he was unfit to reign: Napoleon had told us so before, and prettily we abused him for it. But, now the man declares, under his own hand and seal (unless our government papers have published a forgery), that what Napoleon said of him was true.—As to the effect, which this event will have, with respect to this country, it is pretty evident, I think, that Sweden will, in one way or other, become, if not absolutely an appendage of France, yet so much under her controul as no longer to be able to act contrary to her wish. Whatever of maritime means, therefore, Sweden possesses, will, in all human probability, be brought to bear against us. In this, however, I, for my part, see no danger, if all were well at home; if our system of finance and of military defence were what they ought to be, and what they might so easily be made, we might laugh at Napoleon and all his hundreds of allies. But, if we continue on in our present course; if we are to have new taxes every year besides an addition to the old ones, does any man believe, that we shall be able, in the end, to resist all the means of the continent brought to bear against us? France becomes every day stronger and stronger; she falls, day after day, into the possession of new means; she has no public debt; she has few and light taxes; she has no tax that is inquisitorial; and, what is as much as all the rest, she has no *paper money*, none of that sham representative of property, which, the moment public danger shews its face, becomes much less valuable than it was while it bore the name of rags, and a whole cart-load of which would not procure the holder the means of breaking his fast.

**MR. WARDLE'S PLEDGE.**—I shall, hereafter, have to remark upon the last debate upon Mr. Curwen's *reform* bill, which contained some very curious matter, and which ended in the passing of a bill, not only not the same that was introduced by

Mr. Curwen, not only not like it, but, as to the evident tendency of it, exactly the *opposite* of what was intended by Mr. Curwen, who did, it seems, nevertheless, *vote for it*.—This bill, this measure of reform, which was zealously supported by Mr. *Perceval*, H. *Wellesley*, and Lord *Castlereagh*, will require a full exposure, hereafter. At present, as far as relates to the debate in question, I shall confine myself to a remark or two upon what was said by Mr. *Windham* about “the *haranguers*, who ‘dupered the people by telling them, that eleven millions could be saved, in the annual expenditure of the nation.’”—Does he think, that *anything* can be saved? I will not now enter upon the question of saving; but, I cannot help reminding the reader, that, in the year 1804, Admiral *Markham* told the House of Commons, that, with proper economy, *one third* of the whole of the expences of the Navy might be saved. Now, here is pretty nearly one half of the eleven millions; and yet I beg the reader to observe, that Mr. *Windham* never called Admiral *Markham* an *haranguer*, never accused him of duping the people. Why, the *private bills*, passed in the parliament, cost, I should suppose, the better part of *half a million* of pounds sterling every year. I speak at a rough guess. I may be over the mark. But, surely, be it what it may, the money might be saved to the people; for, though it comes not in the shape of tax, it is the people who pay the money.—Mr. *Wardle* does not merit the contemptuous appellation of *haranguer*. He has *proved* to the nation, that he deals in *matter of fact*. He has never yet promised more than he was able to perform, and has performed. The people firmly believe, that he is able to make good his promise, respecting the reduction of the national expenditure; and, there is no extinguishing this belief by calling him names. I have, for years, believed, and have often expressed that belief, that, except what are necessary to pay the interest upon the public debt, *one half* of the taxes might be taken off, without the smallest injury to the public service, whether civil, naval, or military. Why, the expence of *collecting* the taxes; the bare expence of *keeping the tax gatherers*; this alone costs more than *five millions a year*; that is to say, it is pay for 125,000 able-bodied men at 40*l.* a year, or half a crown a day, each. Here is an army. Here are more people than we have in the navy. Here is about as much money as all the

poor-rates of England and Wales amount to annually. Why, it is *half a guinea a soul*, annually, for all the souls in Great Britain. Can this be necessary? Is it possible, Mr. *Windham*, to save none of this; no part of this most dreadful expence? The number of men, whom this money would support at 40*l.* a year each, is, I believe, *twice as great as the whole number of persons, in all the kingdom, who are, at present, entitled to vote for members of parliament*. Is not this a very curious representative system? Did our forefathers mean this, when, in *Magna Charta*, they declared it to be the ancient and unalterable law of England, that *no man should be taxed without his consent*? And, are we to be called *haranguers*, who dupe the people, because we think, that, besides the immediate expence, it is a great national evil, that *every sixteenth ableman*, at least, should be a tax-gatherer, or employed about the taxes in one way or another? These are not the reflections of empty-headed “*haranguers*,” Mr. *Windham*; nor of *enthusiastic* reformists. They arise from an attentive inquiry into the state of the nation, and they are communicated to the public with the serious and settled design of causing, in time, the evils complained of to be removed. Those are “*haranguers*,” who make speeches by the hour, not only with the certain knowledge, that such speeches will lead to no practical result, but with a desire that they should lead to no such result. Those are “*haranguers*,” who have regular pitched debates, merely for the sake of debating; who, during their debating, affect furious anger against one another, and who, when the combat is over, march away hugging one another by the arm. These are the “*haranguers*;” these are the men who dupe the people; or, rather, who *used to dupe them*; for this sort of political fraud can no longer be practised with success, for which change the public are principally indebted to Mr. *Wardle*.

**AMERICAN STATES.**—Concerning Mr. *Erskine*’s conduct, which has produced such confusion and uncertainty in the commercial relationships between this country and America, much will remain to be said hereafter. It is even now, however, quite clear, that if what has been published as such, be a correct copy of his instructions, he has acted in direct contradiction to them; and that he ought to be called upon to pay for all the loss which merchants and others shall experience in consequence of his having so done, and

which loss is apparently to fall upon us. The progress of this affair should be watched. We should observe what this disobedience of instructions will cost us; I mean in *money*; *money paid down*. Then, we are told, that we have another plenipotentiary appointed thither, whose salary and allowances, are, of course, in the old way, going on, though, perhaps, he may not set off for nine or ten months yet to come. So that, we have, at this time, for the United States, two Embassadors upon *full pay* and one upon *half pay*. And, yet, Mr. Windham seems to think, that nothing can be saved; and that those are merely haranguers, who talk about savings. — But, what I at this time, particularly wish to point out to the reader, as connected with the United States is, the view which the *Morning Chronicle* now takes of the effect, upon *us*, of a suspension of commercial intercourse with that country. — This is a matter of very great national importance, and one as to which I feel more than common interest, having been so positively contradicted, and not a little abused, when about two years ago I combatted the alarms of the *Morning Chronicle* and its *half-yankee* correspondents. — “ Above *seventy* vessels, laden with American produce, have arrived in our ports in consequence of the arrangement made by Mr. Erskine. We do not know as yet the full effect of this inflex, but it cannot fail most materially to reduce the price of every American article. One thing, however, has been made obvious by the cessation of intercourse, and which it is most important for the Legislature to consider; and that is the improved state of our own produce of corn. We have been for two years thrown entirely upon the British farmer for subsistence. We have had no import of wheat or flour, either from the Continents of Europe or America; and yet there has been a sufficient supply in our markets, and the prices have not become exorbitant. It has been demonstrated, not only that we grow enough for our own consumption, but that from the rapid advances made in agriculture, if not now checked by impolitic discouragements, the soil would produce food for double its population, in seven years from this date. We hope that early in the next Session of Parliament, this most important subject will receive a deliberate discussion, and that the system of the Corn Laws will be revised. Fears were entertained that our West India Islands would

have been destitute of provisions, on account of the severe regulations of commercial policy by the American Republic, persevered in to the close of the Presidency of Mr. Jefferson. The result has not justified these apprehensions. A letter received at New York, from Kingston, in Jamaica, states, that the market is glutted with flour, that Irish provisions have been supplied in abundance, and that it was likely, as soon as the House of Assembly should meet, that a duty would be imposed upon American produce.” — Now, Mr. PERRY, this is not candid. “ Fears were entertained?” Aye, faith, were they, and pretty strongly expressed, too, by you and your much-praised correspondent A. B. — You should now have said fairly: “ We did entertain and express our fears upon this subject, to do which we were misled by certainly, lank-haired, plausible Americans; and so piqued were we by the sarcasms of Mr. Cobbett, that though he clearly convinced us of our error, we could not, at that time, bring ourselves to acknowledge it; but, when we have the ‘demonstration’ before us, it would be too bad to persist any longer.” — I have this minute so far got the better of a fit of laziness as to refer to the 12th Volume of the Register, page 257; and, if the reader will do the same, and will go through an article which he will there find, and a few others, of a later date, he will be amused to see how I combatted all those, in parliament or out, who were on the American side, and how exactly I foretold not only the events themselves, but the causes, time, and manner of them. I even took great pains, nine months before that, to point out to the public the objections to the appointment of Mr. Erskine, as will be seen by a reference to vol. X. page 980. — As to the consequences of a stoppage of intercourse with America, few people, very few indeed, were, at first, of my opinion. The current of public persuasion set strongly the other way. Most of the periodical publications were against me; and, which were of most fearful weight, the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Edinburgh Review*. I fairly beat the whole of them, and had the satisfaction to see, at last, the public on my side. — And yet, the public-robbbers would fain persuade people that I am a *low* and *insignificant* person! Why, George Rose and Lord Palmerston and Mr. Sturges and Mr. Poultney and parson Woodecock and Mr. Portal and all the race of the Heathcotes and Chutes whether clerical or military, will never, the whole of them put together,

produce, during their whole lives, a millionth part so much effect in the affairs of the nation, and of the world, as was produced by me in the labour of the single day, the 20th of August, 1807.—So MR. PERRY has, then, in good earnest, found out, that he was in error, too, about the *Barley-growers?* There, again, I had to *fight* another battle against popular delusion, backed by the land-owners and Mr. Arthur Young.—I must return to this subject, when I have more time. But I must even now observe, that, I beg not to be considered as adopting MR. PERRY's opinion, that, in *seven years* from this date, our soil, if agriculture be not discouraged, will produce *double the quantity of food necessary for our subsistence*. You may as well suppose, that a mouse or an ant or a bee will collect together for winter twice as much food as it requires for its support. You may as well suppose, that, in seven years time, we shall be all seized with the humour of purchasing two loaves and two legs of mutton, when we want only one of each. No; Mr. Perry, when a nation finds that it is getting more corn than it wants, it turns its labour into other channels, just as naturally as you and I, when we have filled up our columns, leave off writing, and go at something else.—I beg leave also to disclaim being a party to any hope, that the *corn laws* will become a subject of "*deliberate discussion* during the "*next session of parliament?*" Mr. Perry hopes this, because it is "*a matter of great importance;*" but, that is the very reason, why I would not have it a subject of discussion in parliament. The parliament cannot make corn grow; and its wisest way is, nevermore to say a word about corn laws.—If corn should become *dearer* now, after this re-opening of the intercourse with America, what speculations we shall have amongst the philosophers, who, for the sins of St. James's and Bond Streets, write in the Morning Post and the Courier! What speculations! The cause will be in the *short crop*, which, from present appearances, I think very likely; but, these philosophers always insist, that the *crop is abundant*, and that the high price arises from *some other cause*.

SPAIN.—Intelligence, which I have this day received from Spain, and of which I have hardly time to say a word, gives me some reason to hope, that, at last, the JUNTA AT SEVILLE, that is to say, the Government, has, by this time, adopted the wise measure of encouraging the people to come forth in defence of their country, by

*offering them a government worth fighting for.*—For the *authenticity* of the document, which I here insert below, I pledge myself. I have, in fact, received it from SEVILLE, and though not from a *member* of the Junta, from a person well acquainted with all that was going on, and who speaks in very high terms of the members of that body.—He informs me, that the PROCLAMATION, of which I here insert a translation, was debating, when he wrote, on the 11th of May, and, as he supposed, would be carried.—In the mean while, the *liberty of the press* had revived, and this gentleman, who has been induced to write to me from "*the congeniality of our sentiments*" relative to Spain, has sent me several numbers of a publication, somewhat in the manner of the Register, entitled "*SEMANARIO PATRIOTICO*," abounding in excellent sentiments, and written with great freedom.—The intended Proclamation will speak for itself. Would to God it were issued, and the decree put in full force!—But, LORD WELLESLEY! Aye, I had forgotten that! He is just going off!—Well, let the public bear in mind, that it was at this time, that the Spanish Junta were debating upon the propriety of issuing the following Proclamation and Decree.

Boyley, 15th June, 1809.

#### THE SUPREME GOVERNING JUNTA TO THE SPANISH NATION.

It is three ages, Spaniards, since the salutary laws on which the nation founded its defence against the attempts of tyranny, have been destroyed.—Our fathers did not know how to preserve the precious deposit of liberty, which their fathers had bequeathed them, and although all the provinces of Spain successively struggled to defend it, our evil stars which now began to pursue us, have rendered useless those generous efforts.—After having silenced reason and justice, the laws from that time forward, have been nothing else than an expression, more or less tyrannical, or more or less beneficent of a particular will.—Providence, as if to punish the loss of that beautiful prerogative of freemen, has sentenced us to be unhappy, and paralised our valour, arrested the progress of our understanding, protracted civilization, and after having blundered and exhausted the fountains of prosperity, we have come to that condition, that an insolent Tyrant has formed a project of subduing under his yoke, the greatest nation

of the globe, without reckoning upon its will, and despising its resistance. — In vain have there been some instances within these last three ages of disasters, in which the best directed will of the princes has attempted to remedy this, or the other plagues of the state.—In vain the increased illustration of Europe has lately inspired our statesmen with projects of Reforms, both useful, and necessary.—Buildings cannot be erected upon sands, and without fundamental and constituted laws to defend the good already done, and to prevent the evil which is intended to be done, it is useless for the philosopher in his study, and the public man in the theatre of business, to exert himself, for the good of the people. The most useful meditations, the best combined projects, are either not put in execution, or if they should be, they immediately fall to the ground.—In the moment of a happy inspiration, succeeds another of an unfortunate one—to the spirit of economy and order, a spirit of prodigality and rapine—to a prudent and mild minister, an avaricious and mad favourite—to the moderation of a pacific monarch, the rage of an inhuman conqueror—and thus, without principles, without an established and fixed system to which public measures and dispositions can be affixed, the ship of the state floats without her sails, without a helm or direction, until, as has happened to the Spanish Monarchy, it is dashed to pieces on some rock by the hurricane of Tyranny.—The evils which are derived from so vicious a beginning cannot be calculated, when they are accumulated in such a manner, that nothing less than a Revolution can destroy them.—The Junta itself, in the midst of the power which you had placed in its hands, a power which makes them tremble on account of its unlimited extension, frequently meets in those ancient vices, insuperable difficulties in the execution of its wishes. — If the disorders of the Government in the last twenty years had been less, believe, Spaniards, that your evils at this moment would not be so great—believe, that our enemies would not enjoy the advantages they obtained, not over the zeal and prudence of your Government, nor over the valour and constancy which every moment are greater in you, but over the ruinous and miserable state to which the many years of arbitrary government which has been passing over us, has brought us to.—Thus it is, that when the Supreme Junta

took upon itself the supreme authority, it did not deem itself less called upon to defend you from the enemy, than to procure and establish your interior felicity on a solid basis.—It announced this solemnly to you from the beginning, and as solemnly obliged itself in the face of the world to the performance of this sacred duty.—The events of the war prevented at that time the commencing the grand work, to which it is now going to put its hand, and the unexpected commotions which have succeeded, one after another, seemed to require the suspension of any other object, and to wait for more serene and tranquil times.—But, the Junta never lost sight of this grand thought, the same chain of evils, with which fortune, when roused, delights in proving our constancy, is that which precipitates its execution.—How other ways can be recompensed those floods of blood which run through every corner of the Peninsula!—those sacrifices which at every instant the Spanish loyalty presents without being over fatigued by them, that moral resistance, as universal, as it is sublime, which disconcerts, and renders desperate our enemies, even in the midst of their victories. He must have a breast of brass, who, to a people that so magnanimously resists so cruel a calamity, should not point out to him immediately a crown of happiness, which awaits him, as a recompence for his heroic fatigues. When this dreadful contest is concluded, no less beautiful for our people, when persecuted by misfortune, than when crowned by victory, the Spaniard shall say to himself, with that full pride which his situation ought to inspire him, “ My fathers have “ left me for an inheritance, slavery and “ misery—I leave to my descendants “ liberty and glory.” This sentiment of future happiness, which, by reflection in some, and by instinct in all, animates you at present, Spaniards, is the same which has made you abhor the former tyranny, which has reduced you to the deplorable state in which you see yourself; the same which filled you with enthusiasm and with hope when you should be able to destroy it, and raise to the throne that innocent prince, who most sincerely wished to make you happy; the same which gave you valour and boldness to declare war against the most powerful nation, without armies and without resources; the same, in a word, which inspired you with invincible horror against that tyrant who has thrown upon you all the plagues of

misfortune. Know then, that this institution of happiness shall not be defrauded of its hopes. Let us take from our detractors every pretext for calumniating us; they say that we are fighting incessantly to defend our ancient abuses, and the inveterate and enormous vices of our corrupted administration. But let them know, from this moment, that your battles, although for independence, are also for the felicity of your country. Let them know that you do not wish to depend henceforward on the uncertain will, or the variable temperament, of one man only; that you do not wish to continue to be the plaything of a court without justice, under the control of an insolent favorite, or of a capricious woman; and that on the renewal of the august edifice of your ancient laws, you wish to place an eternal barrier between the death-bearing despotism of your sacred rights. This barrier, Spaniards, consists in a good Constitution, to aid and support the operations of the Monarch, when they are just, and to restrain them when he follows evil counsels. Without a Constitution, all Reform is precarious, all prosperity uncertain; without it, the people are no more than flocks of slaves, put in motion at the order of a will, frequently unjust, and always unrestrained; without it, the forces of the entire society, intended to procure the greatest advantages for all its members, are employed exclusively to satisfy the ambition, or satiate the phrenzy of a few, and perhaps of only one. It is absolutely necessary that you should have a Constitution, by which a Reform of all the branches which are to contribute to your prosperity, are solidly secured; from whence the basis and principles of a sociable organization, worthy of men like you, may be derived. This Constitution, Spaniards, ought to be the principal effect of your toils, a comfort for the desolation you have suffered, the reward of your labour, and the hopes of your victories. It certainly will not exhibit the infamous characters which are contained in the infamous Code published by Napoleon at Bayonne, and framed long before in the deposit of his intrigues. With it they wanted to legitimate the most monstrous usurpation, known in the annals of the world. With ours, it is intended to secure the public prosperity of the state, and the particular one of the citizens, performing *bona fide*, what all the nation wishes; in that there was not time to deliberate, nor liberty to resist, nor powers to es-

tablish. In ours, the actual Representatives of the nation will excite wise men to expose freely what they think, they will call them to examine, and discuss the same political truths, and the best form of its application; and the work of their knowledge, their zeal, and their experience, shall be presented before the free sanction of the nation, solemnly assembled in Cortes. The insidious forms of the Constitution of Bayonne are not sufficient to disguise the legalised despotism that appears in every part of it. In the Spanish Constitution, the Public Will, lawfully and sufficiently expressed, shall be the *Law*; government limiting its functions, within the terms which nature has pointed out in the political order. The consequences of the one, worthy in every respect of the fountain of iniquity from whence they spring, have been, the plunder, the perdition, the ruin, and the deplorable desolation of the men and of the people, for whose felicity it was said to be intended. The other, founded on the basis of virtue, and purchased at the expence of the most glorious efforts of patriotism, will have for its undeniable results, the liberty, and lasting happiness of the Spanish nation. The Supreme Junta has taken the rudder of the Monarchy, in the midst of the storm, and will only keep it, whilst danger and uncertainty exist, contributing by these direct and principal ways to cast this grand anchor, which so materially contributes to save the country from danger, in doing which it believes, that it fills one of its most religious obligations.

This should not be less glorious in the eyes of the nation, and of its political interests, than the extirpation of its enemies, and the triumph of the Spanish arms; and when the day comes, that it shall lay down the authority now invested in them into the hands of that government, which the Constitution shall appoint, it will be for them the most glorious day of their political existence. Then they will think themselves rewarded for their watchfulness, their cares, and the dangers to which they are subject, by exercising a power to which they were not elevated by ambition, nor called by intrigue, but by the unanimous and determined vote of the provinces of the kingdom, that have sworn to be independent of all foreign dominion, and within themselves free and happy. Such have been the considerations the Supreme Junta had in view, in agreeing to the following Decree:

## ROYAL DECREE.

The Supreme Governing Power of the kingdom, considering it to be its primary obligation to free the country from the evils which have until now afflicted it; all which have been occasioned by the arbitrary laws to which it has been subject; pursuing the just and mild intentions of our very beloved king Ferdinand the 7th, who was desirous to re-constitute the Monarchy, re-establishing in it the National Representation of its *ancient Cortes*, desirous that the nation should take before the eyes of Europe and of the Universe, the noble and strong acts of a people worthy and legally constituted, desirous that this great work should be performed, which the circumstances command, and the heroic sacrifices of the people require, anxious that it should approach to that degree of perfection which men are allowed to obtain, when they proceed with good faith, and with a desire of doing right, has decreed as follows :

1st. All wise Spaniards who have meditated on projects of Reform with respect to the constitution of the kingdom in general, as well as on the particular branches of public administration, are invited by the Junta to communicate their ideas with full liberty, and as they may judge may answer best for the good of their country.

2nd. Those Writings shall be sent to the Junta through the Secretary's Office, within the term of two months from the date of this decree, and the authors will subscribe their names, or a mark by which they may be known in proper time.

3rd. These Writings after being examined in a summary way, the writers of those which are found to be really useful by the observations, or by the knowledge they contain, shall be called upon, in order to take a part in the Commissions of Reform, which shall be immediately created.

4th. These Commissions shall be presided each by a member of the Junta, and in them will be examined and prepared the works which are to be presented for approbation.

5th. The Projects approved of by the Junta shall be presented to the National Sanction, and from it will receive the character, and the force of law.

6th. The Junta does not anticipate its judgment, to prepossess the public opinion with respect to these projects, it only believes that it ought to announce from this moment certain principles, upon which

the wish and desire of the nation has irreversibly resolved, and from which nothing that can be written or discussed on the subject of Reform, can alter. Those principles are reduced to the following :

The Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Religion, is the only Religion of the State.—The constitution of Spain is to be a monarchy, hereditary in Ferdinand the 7th, his descendants, and those called by the Law to succeed them.—The nation is to be governed henceforward by the Laws freely deliberated, and administered—there shall be a *National Cortes*, in the manner and form which may be established, taking into consideration the difference and alterations which have taken place since the time when they were lawfully held.—*Our Americas and other colonies* shall be the same as the Metropolis in *all Rights and Constitutional Prerogatives*.—The reform which our legal codes, administration, and recovery of public rents, and every thing belonging to the direction of commerce, agriculture, arts, education, as well national, marine, and warlike, are to undergo, shall be only and exclusively directed to obtain the greatest ease, and the better illustration of the Spanish people, so horridly teased until now.

7. The nation which shall be legally and solemnly constituted from On that day, the *General Cortes* of the Spanish monarchy, after being so long neglected, shall meet together for the first time.

COBBETT'S  
COMPLETE COLLECTION OF  
State Trials :

To be completed in Thirty-Six Monthly Parts, forming Twelve large Volumes in Royal Octavo.

The SIXTH PART of the above Work was published on Thursday the 1st instant. One Part will appear, with the greatest regularity, on the first of each succeeding Month. Those Subscribers who have expressed their intention of taking the Work in Quarterly Volumes, are respectfully informed that the Second Volume is now ready for delivery.—In order to remove all professional doubts, as to how far this new and enlarged Edition of the State Trials may, with safety, be cited as authority in the Courts, and relied on as of equal authenticity with the former, I think it right to state, that it is intended to be a literal transcript of the last edition, as far as that

edition extends; that where I have inserted fuller and better reports of any Cases, or of any parts of Cases, the text of the old Edition will nevertheless be retained; and that the new matter will be distinguished in a manner not to be mistaken, and be distinctly pointed out in the Table of Contents to each volume.—In the last Volume will also be given what I call a PARALLEL INDEX, consisting of two Columns; in the first of which will be inserted, in their order, the numbers of all the Pages in the last Edition; and in the other, correspondent figures shewing in what Volume and Page of the present Work the contents of each page of the last Edition will be found; by means of which Parallel Index, the place in this Work of any passage occurring in the last Edition, may be ascertained with nearly as much ease and expedition as if the paging of that Edition were preserved; which, it is obvious, would be perfectly impracticable, considering the valuable mass of new matter to be introduced.

To such Gentlemen as may happen to be in possession of curious Trials, or of documents relating to Trials of the description of those to be contained in this Work, I shall be much obliged for a communication of them. If the document, or paper, whether in print or manuscript, be requested to be preserved, great care shall be taken of it.

The following is a List of the Articles contained in the First and Second Volumes; from which it will be seen, that of the 126 Trials or Proceedings, of which they consist, *Fifty-nine* never before came into any collection.

\* \* \* *The new Matter is marked [N.]*

#### CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

Prefaces to former Editions of the State Trials.  
Mr. Salmon's Preface to the first Edition of the State Trials, in four volumes folio: printed in the year 1719.

Mr. Salmon's Preface to the case of Ship Money, which was printed in a separate volume, by way of Supplement to the first Edition.

Mr. Emlyn's Preface to the second Edition of the State Trials, in six volumes folio: printed in the year 1730.

Preface to the seventh and eighth volumes of the State Trials: printed in the year 1735.

Preface to the Ninth and Tenth Volumes of the State Trials: printed in the year 1766.

Mr. Hargrave's Preface to the Fourth Edition of the State Trials, in Ten volumes folio: printed in the Year 1775.

Mr. Hargrave's Preface to the Eleventh (or Supplemental) Volume of the Fourth Edi-

tion of the State Trials: printed in the Year 1781.

#### STATE TRIALS IN THE REIGN OF HENRY THE SECOND.

- Proceedings against Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, for High Treason, 1163. [N.]

#### HENRY THE THIRD.

- Articles of Accusation against Hubert De Burgh, with the Answers of Master Lawrence, Clerk of St. Albans, on behalf of Hubert de Burgh, earl of Kent, 1239. [N.]

#### EDWARD THE FIRST.

- Proceedings against Piers Gaveston, 1307, [N.]

#### EDWARD THE SECOND.

- Proceedings against Hugh and Hugh le Despenser, 1320. [N.]
- Proceedings against Adam de Orleton, bishop of Hereford, for Treason, 1323. [N.]
- Proceedings against Thomas Earl of Lancaster, for Treason, 1327. [N.]
- Proceedings against King Edward the Second, 1327. [N.]

#### EDWARD THE THIRD.

- Impeachment of Roger Mortimer, Earl of March, for Treason, 1330. [N.]
- Proceedings against Thomas de Berkele, for the Murder of King Edward the Second, 1331. [N.]
- Proceedings against John Stratford, Archbishop of Canterbury, for Treason, 1341. [N.]
- Proceedings against John Wickliffe, for Heresy, 1377. [N.]

#### RICHARD THE SECOND.

- Proceedings in Parliament against Alexander Nevil, Archbishop of York, Robert Vere, Duke of Ireland, Michael de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, Robert Tresilian, Lord Chief Justice of England, and Nicholas Brambre, some time Mayor of London, and Others, for High Treason, 1388.
- Impeachment of Thomas Fitz-Alan, Archbishop of Canterbury, of High Treason, 1397. [N.]
- Impeachment of Thomas Duke of Gloucester, Richard Earl of Arundel, Thomas Earl of Warwick, Thomas Mortimer, and Sir John Cobham, knight, of High Treason, 1397. [N.]

#### HENRY THE FOURTH.

- Articles of Accusation against Richard the Second, King of England, 1399. [N.]
- Proceedings against John Hall, for the Murder of Thomas Duke of Gloucester, 1399. [N.]
- Proceedings against William Sancre, for Heresy, 1400. [N.]
- Trial and Examination of Master William Thorpe, Preste, for Heresy, before Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury: written by himself, 1407.

19. Proceedings against John Badby, for Heresy, 1409. [N.]

#### HENRY THE FIFTH.

20. Trial and Examination of sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, for Heresy, before the Archbishop of Canterbury: 1409.

#### HENRY THE SIXTH.

21. Proceedings, upon an *ex post facto* Act, against sir John Mortimer, for making his Escape from Prison, 1421. [N.]

22. Proceedings against Henry Beaufort, bishop of Winchester, for High Treason, 1426, [N.]

23. Proceedings against William de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk, for High Treason, 1451. [N.]

#### EDWARD THE FOURTH.

24. Proceedings against George Duke of Clarence, brother to king Edward the Fourth, for Treason, 1478. [N.]

#### HENRY THE SEVENTH.

25. Trial of Sir William Stanley, knight, for High Treason, 1494.

#### HENRY THE EIGHTH.

26. Trial of Sir Thomas Empson, knight, and Edmund Dudley, esq. for High Treason, 1509.

27. Trial of Edward Duke of Buckingham, for High Treason, 1522.

28. Proceedings relating to the Dissolution of the Marriage between Henry the Eighth and Catherine of Arragon, 1533. [N.]

29. Proceedings against Thomas Wolsey, Cardinal and Archbishop of York, upon a præsumptio, and for other offences, 1529. [N.]

30. The Trial of sir Thomas More, kn. Lord Chancellor of England, for High Treason, in denying the King's Supremacy, 1535.

31. The Trial of John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, before Commissioners of Oyer and Terminer, at Westminster, for High Treason, 1535.

32. The Trial of William Lord Dacres of the North, for High Treason, in the Court of the Lord High Steward, 1535.

33. The Trials of Queen Anna Boleyn, and her Brother Lord Viscount Rochford, for High Treason, in the Court of the Lord High Steward; and also of Henry Norris, Mark Smeton, William Brereton, and sir Francis Weston, before Commissioners of Oyer and Terminer, for the same Offence, 1536.

34. Proceedings against Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex, for High Treason, 1541. [N.]

35. The Trial of Lord Leonard Grey, at Westminster, for High Treason, 1541.

36. The Trial of sir Edmond Knevet, at Greenwich, for striking a person within the King's Palace there, 1541.

37. Proceedings against Queen Catherine Howard, for Incontinency, 1542. [N.]

38. The Trial of Henry Earl of Surrey, for High Treason, with the Proceedings against

his Father, Thomas Duke of Norfolk, for the same Crime, 1546.

39. Proceedings against Various Persons in the Reign of Henry 8, for Treason, in denying the King's Supremacy; and other capital Crimes, principally relating to Religion.

#### EDWARD THE SIXTH.

40. Proceedings in Parliament against Sir Thomas Seymour, kn. Lord Seymour of Sudeley, for High Treason, 1549.

41. Proceedings in Parliament against Edward Duke of Somerset, Lord Protector, for Misdemeanors and High Treason, 1550.

42. Proceedings in Parliament against Edward Duke of Somerset, for High Treason and Felony, at Westminster, 1551.

43. Proceedings concerning the Non-Conformity in Religion of the Lady Mary, Sister of King Edward the Sixth, afterwards Queen of England, 1551. [N.]

44. Proceedings against Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, for opposing the Reformation of Religion, and disobeying the King's Orders and Injunctions respecting the same, 1551. [N.]

45. Proceedings against Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, for opposing the Reformation of Religion, 1550. [N.]

#### MARY.

46. Proceedings against sir James Hales, Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, for his Conduct at the Assizes in Kent, 1553. [N.]

47. Proceedings against Lady Jane Grey, and Others, for Treason, 1553. [N.]

48. Arraignment and Execution of Henry Grey Duke of Suffolk, 1553. [N.]

49. Trials of John Dudley Duke of Northumberland, William Parr Marquis of Northampton, and John Dudley Earl of Warwick, for High Treason, in the Court of the Lord High Steward, at Westminster: and also of Sir John Gates, Sir Henry Gates, Sir Andrew Dudley, and Sir Thomas Palmer, at Westminster, for the same Crime, 1553.

50. Proceedings against Thomas Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury, for Treason and Heresy, 1556. [N.]

51. The Arraignment of Sir Thomas Wyat, kn. at Westminster, for High Treason, 1554.

52. The Trial of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, kn. in the Guildhall of London, for High Treason: Together with the Proceedings against sir Nicholas Throckmorton's Jury, 1554.

#### ELIZABETH.

53. The Trial of James Earl Bothwell, for the Murder of Henry Lord Darnley, Husband of Mary Queen of Scots, at the Seire House of Edinburgh, 1567.

54. The Trial and Sentence of William Powrie, George Dalgleish, John Hay younger of Talo, and John Heyborn of Bowton, concerning the Murder of Henry Earl Darn-

- ley, Husband of Mary Queen of Scots: with their Examinations, Depositions, and Confessions: as also, the Declaration of Nicholas Hubert, a Frenchman, commonly called Paris, in relation to that Murder, and other matters, 1557.
55. Trial of the Earl of Morton, for the Murder of Henry Lord Darnley, Husband of Mary Queen of Scots, 1581. [N.]
56. The Trial of Thomas Howard Duke of Norfolk, before the Lords at Westminster, for High Treason, 1571.
57. The Trial of Mr. Robert Hickford, (Servant of the Duke of Norfolk), at the Queen's Bench, for High Treason, 1571.
58. The Arraignment of Edmund Campion, Sherwin, Bosgrave, Cottam, Johnson, Bristow, Kirbie, and Orton, for High Treason, 1581. [N.]
59. Arraignment, Judgment and Execution of John Story, for Treason, 1571. [N.]
60. The Trial of Dr. William Parry, at Westminster, for High Treason, 1584.
61. Inquisition of a Jury of the City of London before the Coroner, had upon occasion of the Death of the Earl of Northumberland: with a Report of his Treasons, 1585. [N.]
62. Proceedings against Anthony Babington, Chidiock Titchburne, Thomas Salisbury, Robert Barnewell, John Savage, Henry Donn, and John Ballard, at Westminster, for High Treason, 1586.
63. The Trial of Edward Abington, Charles Tilney, Edward Jones, John Travers, John Charnock, Jerome Bellamy, and Robert Gage, at Westminster, for High Treason, 1586.
64. Proceedings against Mary Queen of Scots; for being concerned in a Conspiracy against Queen Elizabeth; with things previous thereto, and necessary to introduce and explain those Proceedings, 1586.
65. The Arraignment of William Davison (Secretary of State to Queen Elizabeth) in the Star-Chamber, for Misprision and Contempt, 1587.
66. The Trial of Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, before the Lords, for High Treason, 1589.
67. The Arraignment of Sir Richard Knightly, and Others, in the Star-Chamber, for maintaining seditious Persons, Books, and Libels, 1588.
68. The Trial of Mr. John Udall, a Puritan Minister, at Croydon Assizes, for Felony, 1590.
69. The Trial of Sir John Perrot, Lord Deputy of Ireland, at Westminster, for High Treason, 1592.
70. The Trial of Robert Earl of Essex, and Henry Earl of Southampton, before the Lords, at Westminster, for High Treason, 1600.
71. Proceedings in Parliament against John Earl of Gowrie, Alexander Ruthven his Brother, Henry Ruthven, Hugh Moncrief, and Peter Eviot, for High Treason, 1600.
72. The Arraignment and Judgment of Cap-

- tain Thomas Lee, at the Sessions-house near Newgate, for High Treason, 1600.
73. The Trial of Sir Christopher Blunt, Sir Charles Davers, Sir John Davis, Sir Gilly Merrick, and Henry Cuffe, at Westminster, for High Treason, 1600.

## VOL. II.

## JAMES THE FIRST.

74. The Trial of Sir Walter Raleigh, kn. at Winchester, for High Treason, 1603.
75. The Trial of Sir Grilin Markham, kn. sir Edward Parham, kn. George Brooke, esq. Bartholomew Brookesby, esq. Anthony Copley, William Watson, Priest, and William Clarke, Priest, for High Treason, at Winchester, 1603.
76. Proceedings in a Conference at Hampton Court, respecting Reformation of the Church, 1604 [N.]
77. The Case between Sir Francis Goodwin and Sir John Fortescue, relative to a Return for the County of Buckingham, 1604.
78. The Case of Mixed Money in Ireland, 1605.
79. *Articuli Cleri:* Articles (so intitled by Lord Coke) of Complaint against the Judges of the Realm; exhibited by Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the name of the whole Clergy, 1605. Together with the Answers thereto by all the Judges and Barons [N.]
80. The Trials of Robert Winter, Thomas Winter, Guy Fawkes, John Grant, Ambrose Rookwood, Robert Keyes, Thomas Bates, and Sir Everard Digby, at Westminster, for High Treason, being Conspirators in the Gunpowder-Plot, 1606.
81. The Trial of Henry Garnet, Superior of the Jesuits in England, at the Guildhall of London, for High Treason, being a Conspirator in the Gunpowder Plot, 1606.
82. A true Report of the Arraignment, Tryall, Conviction and Condemnation, of a Popish Priest, named Robert Drewrie, at the Sessions-house in the Old Baylie, on Friday and Wednesday, the 20th and 24th of February, 1607 [N.]
83. The Case of Impositions, on an Information in the Exchequer by the Attorney-General against Mr. John Bates, Merchant, 1606—1610.
84. The Conviction and Attainder of Robert Lalor, Priest, being indicted on the Statute of the 16th Richard II. cap. 5: Commonly called, The Case of Praemunire in Ireland.
85. The Case of the Postnati, or of the Union of the Realm of Scotland with England, 1608.
86. The Trial of George Sprot, in Scotland, for High Treason, in conspiring with John Earl of Gowrie, to murder King James I. 1608.
87. The Process and Trial of Robert Logan, of Restalrig, for High Treason, in conspiring with John Earl of Gowrie, to murder King James I. 1609.

88. The Trial of Lord Balmerinoth, at St. Andrews, for High Treason, 1609.
89. The Case of Proclamations, 1610 [N.]
90. The Cases of Bartholomew Legat and Edward Wightman, for Heresy, 1612 [N.]
91. The Earl of Shrewsbury's Case; or the Case of Dignities, 1612 [N.]
92. The Arraignment and Confession of the Lord Sanquire, (who, being a Baron of Scotland, was arraigned by the name of Robert Creighton, esq.) at the King's-bench Bar, in Westminster-hall, the 27th of June, for procuring the Murder of John Turner, a Master of Defence, whom he caused to be shot with a Pistol by one Carliel, a Scottish-man, for thrusting out one of his Eyes in playing at Rapier and Dagger, 1612.
93. Proceedings against Mr. James White-locke, in the Star-Chamber, for a Contempt of the King's Prerogative, 1613.
94. Proceedings against Mary Countess of Shrewsbury, before Select Council, for a Contempt in refusing to answer fully before the Privy Council, or to subscribe her Examination, 1612.
95. Case of Mr. William Talbot, on an information *ore tenus*, for maintaining a Power in the Pope to depose and kill Kings, 1613.
96. Proceedings between the Lady Frances Howard, Countess of Essex, and Robert Earl of Essex, her Husband, before the King's Delegates, in a Cause of Divorce, 1618.
97. The Earl of Northampton's Case, 1613 [N.]
98. Proceedings against Dr. Richard Neile, Bishop of Lincoln, for Words spoken in the House of Lords, 1614 [N.]
99. The Case of Edmund Peacham, for Treason, 1615 [N.]
100. The Case of John Owen, otherwise Collins, for Treason, 1615 [N.]
101. Proceedings against John Ogilvie, for High Treason, at Glasgow, in Scotland, 1615.
102. The Case of Mr. Oliver St. John, on an Information *ore tenus*, in the Star-Chamber, for writing and publishing a Paper against a Benevolence collected under Letters of the Privy-Council, 1615.
103. The Trial of Richard Weston, at the Guildhall of London, for the Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, 1615.
104. The Trial of Anne Turner, Widow, at the King's-bench, for the Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, 1615.
105. The Trial of Sir Jervis Elwes, knt. Lieutenant of the Tower, at the Guildhall of London, for the Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, 1615.
106. The Trial of James Franklin, at the King's-bench, for the Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, 1615.
107. The Arraignment of Sir Thomas Monson, knt. at the Guildhall of London, for the Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, 1615.
108. The Trial of the Lady Frances Countess of Somerset, for the Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, 1616.
109. The Trial of Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset, for the Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, 1616.
110. The Proceedings against Sir John Hollis, Sir John Wentworth, and Mr. Lumsden, in the Star-Chamber, for traducing the Public Justice, 1615.
111. The Case of Duels; or Proceedings in the Star-Chamber, against Mr. William Priest, for writing and sending a Challenge, and Mr. R. Wright for carrying it, 1615.
112. The Case of Mary Smith, for Witchcraft, 1616 [N.]
113. Proceedings against Mr. Wrayham, in the Star Chamber, for slandering the Lord-Chancellor Bacon of Injustice, 1618.
114. The Case of Williams, of Essex, for Treason, 1619 [N.]
115. Proceedings in Parliament against Francis Bacon Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Albans, Lord Chancellor of England, upon an Impeachment for Bribery and Corruption in the Execution of his Office: And also against Dr. Theophilus Field, Bishop of Llandaff, 1620.
116. Proceedings in Parliament against Sir Giles Mompesson, a Monopolist and Patentee, 1620 [N.]
117. Proceedings in Parliament against Sir Francis Michell, a Monopolist and Patentee, and Co-partner with Sir Giles Mompesson, 1621 [N.]
118. Proceedings against Sir Henry Yelverton, the King's Attorney-General, for Misdemeanors, 1621 [N.]
119. Proceedings in Parliament against Sir John Bennett, knt. for Bribery and Corruption, 1621 [N.]
120. Proceedings in Parliament against Edward Floyde, for scandalizing the Princess Palatine, 1621 [N.]
121. Proceedings against George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, for the killing of Edward Hawkins, one of the Lord Zouch's Keepers, 1621 [N.]
122. Proceedings on the Impeachment of the Lord Treasurer Middlesex, for High Crimes and Misdemeanors, 1624 [N.]
123. Proceedings in Parliament against Samuel Harsnet, Bishop of Norwich, for Extortion and other Misdemeanors, 1624 [N.]

## CHARLES THE FIRST.

124. Proceedings in Parliament against Richard Mountague, Clerk, for publishing a factious and seditious Book, 1625 [N.]
125. Proceedings in Parliament against the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Bristol, and the Lord Conway, for High Crimes and Misdemeanors, 1626 [N.]
126. Case of George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, for refusing to licence a Sermon preached by Dr. Sibthorpe, in order to promote the Loan and to justify the King's imposing Public Taxes without consent of Parliament, 1627 [N.]

## PROCEEDINGS

*In COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &c. relative to the recent Inquiry in the House of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK. (Continued from p. 889.)*

## TOWN OF HUDDERSFIELD.

At a numerous and respectable Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Town and Neighbourhood of Huddersfield held this day, May 30, 1809, (in pursuance of public Notice given for that purpose,)—Joshua Ingham, esq. in the Chair,—It was resolved unanimously,

1. That the grateful Thanks of this Meeting be given to G. L. Wardle, esq. for the undaunted, firm, and patriotic manner in which he brought forward, and prosecuted the late Inquiry into the Conduct of his Royal Highness the Duke of York; as his exertions to develope the existence of Abuses and Corruption, (during which the utmost influence of the whole phalanx of ministers, placemen, and pensioners, was used to intimidate, futilize, and baffle the evidence brought forward by him;) not only occasioned the removal of his Royal Highness from office, but, by having opened the eyes of the country to the conduct of their Representatives, is likely to be productive of the happiest and most important consequences to the nation at large.

2. That the Thanks of this Meeting be also given to sir Francis Burdett, bart. (who seconded and supported the Motion of Mr. Wardle,) to lord Folkestone, Mr. Windbread, sir S. Romilly, gen. Ferguson, adm. Markham, and the rest of the independent Minority of 125, who, by the manly avowal of their sentiments, and their conscientious and unbiassed Votes, in support of the said Motion, have shown themselves at once the Friends of the People and the Enemies of Corruption:—Also, to W. Wilberforce, esq. and lord Milton, (members for this great and populous county,) for the support they gave to the said Inquiry.

3. That ministers, by their conduct during the late Investigation, in endeavouring to prevent the exposure and reform of abuses, and by ranging themselves as the defenders and supporters of delinquents, have acted in direct opposition to their duty, as servants of the nation.

4. That the patriotic exertions of the public, and their patient endurance of the enormous and extraordinary burdens imposed upon them, entitle them to expect the utmost vigilance and economy in the

administration of the public money; and that delinquents do not escape the infamy and punishment their peculation so justly merits.

5. That it appears by a Report laid on the table of the House of Commons, in June last, in consequence of a Motion made by lord Cochrane, (for that purpose,) that 78 of its members receive 178,994 £. a-year, out of the taxes raised upon the people, and of course out of the money to watch over the expenditure of which they are appointed; being in direct opposition to the act of parliament commonly called the Act of Settlement, and in virtue of which act, his majesty's family was raised to the throne of this kingdom, and which expressly states, “That no person who has an Office, or Place of Profit under the king, or receives a Pension from the crown, shall be capable of serving as a member of the House of Commons.”—A radical Reform in the Representation of the Commons House of Parliament is, therefore, become absolutely necessary, to the restoration of the Constitution; and this Meeting highly approves of the Resolutions passed for that purpose, at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, London, on the first of May, 1809; believing that, without having recourse to theoretical speculations, or dangerous experiments in government, such a Reform, by recurring to the principles handed down to us by the wisdom and virtue of our forefathers, will effectually extirpate most, and check all those Abuses, the baneful effects of which are so widely extended, and so sensibly felt.

6. That it is, for the reasons above-mentioned, the duty of the Inhabitants of Britain urgently, but temperately, to apply for the adoption of such measures as shall secure the reality and uses of representation, especially at this eventful moment, when all the nations that surround us have paid the forfeit of their corruption in the annihilation of their governments.

7. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to those well-tried friends of their country, lord Cochrane, Mr. Madocks, major Cartwright, and other truly respectable characters, who are advocates for a full and fair Representation of the People in the Commons House of Parliament; a remedy which is equally necessary to the safety of the throne and the happiness and independence of the people.”

8. That the Chairman be requested to sign these Resolutions as the act of this Meeting, and to transmit copies thereof to G. L. Wardle, esq. and to those gentle-

men mentioned in the 2nd and 7th Resolutions. JOSHUA INGHAM, Chairman.

Resolved unanimously, That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the Chairman, for his conduct in the Chair.

(*To be continued.*)

### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

FRENCH ARMY IN AUSTRIA.—*Sixth Bulletin*  
(concluded from p. 896.)

the enemy, 40,000 quintals, 400,000 rations of biscuits, and some hundred thousands of rations of bread. Austria had formed these magazines in order to march forward. They have been of great use to us.

*Seventh Bulletin, dated Vienna, May 13.*

On the 10th, at nine of the morning, the Emperor appeared before the gates of Vienna, with the corps of marshal duke of Montebello. It was at the same hour, on the same day, and exactly one month after the Austrian army had passed the Inn, and the Emperor Francis II. had rendered himself guilty of a perjury, the signal of his ruin. On the 5th of May the archduke Maximilian, brother of the Empress, a young prince, 26 years of age, presumptuous and without experience, of an ardent character, assumed the government of Vienna, and issued two Proclamations. Gen. Couroux traversed the suburbs, and gen. Tharreau repaired to the esplanade which separates them from the city. At the instant he reached it, he was received by a discharge of musketry and cannon, and was slightly wounded. Of 300,000 inhabitants who compose the population of Vienna, the city, properly so called, which is surrounded by a bastion and a counterscarp, scarcely contains 80,000 inhabitants and 1,300 houses. The eight faubourgs of the town, which have retained the name of suburbs, and are separated from the city by a vast esplanade, and covered on the side of the country by intrenchments, inclose more than 5,000 houses, and are inhabited by more than 220,000, who draw their subsistence from the city, where are the markets and shops. The archduke Maximilian had caused registers to be opened for collecting the names of the inhabitants who were willing to defend themselves. Thirty individuals only inscribed their names: all the others refused with indignation. Defeated in his hopes by the good sense of the people of Vienna, he collected ten battalions of the militia (landwher) and ten battalions of the line,

composing a force of from 15,000 to 16,000 men, and threw himself within the place.—The duke of Montebello sent him an aide-de-camp with a summons; but some butchers, and a few hundred fellows, satellites of the archduke Maximilian, rushed upon the parliamentaire, and one of them wounded him. The archduke ordered the wretch who had committed this infamous action to be led in triumph through the city, mounted on the horse of the French officer, and surrounded by the militia.—After this unheard-of violation of the rights of nations, the horrid spectacle was seen of one part of the city drawing upon the other part, and citizens directing their arms against their fellow citizens. His Majesty assured the deputies of his protection. He expressed the pain which the inhuman conduct of their sovereign had given him, who had not feared to deliver up his capital to all the calamities of war—who, himself striking a blow at his rights, instead of being the king and father of his subjects, had evinced himself their enemy and tyrant. His Majesty assured them that Vienna should be treated with the same indulgence and favour which had been displayed in 1805. The deputation answered this assurance by expressions of the most lively gratitude. At nine of the morning the duke of Rivoli, with the divisions Saint Cyr and Boudet, took possession of the Leopoldstadt. During this time, lieut. gen. O'Reilly sent lieut. gen. de Vaux and col. Bellonte to treat for the capitulation of the place. The annexed capitulation was signed in the evening, and on the 13th, at six of the morning, the grenadiers of Oudinot's corps took possession of the city. At nine of the evening a battery of 20 obusses, raised by generals Bertrand and Navalet, at 100 fathoms from the place, began the bombardment: 1,800 obusses were shot in less than four hours, and soon the whole appeared to be in flames. One must have seen Vienna, its houses of eight or nine stories, its narrow streets, and numerous population, within so narrow a compass, in order to form an idea of the tumult, disorder, and disasters which such an operation could not but occasion.—The archduke Maximilian had, at one in the morning, caused two battalions to march in close column, in order to attempt retaking the pavilion, which covered the raising of the bridge. The two companies of voltigeurs received them with a discharge of musquetry, which, with the 15 pieces of artillery from the right side, destroyed a part of the co-

lumn, and forced them to fly in great disorder.—The archduke lost all presence of mind in the midst of the bombardment, and especially at the moment when he heard that we had crossed an arm of the Danube, and were on the march to cut off his retreat. As feeble and weak as he had been rash and arrogant, he was the first to fly and recross the bridge. The respectable general O'Reilly learnt only by the flight of the archduke, that he was invested with the command. Day-break on the 12th announced to the advanced guard, that the firing would cease, and that a deputation was about to be sent to the Emperor.—This deputation was presented to his majesty in the park of Schoenbrunn. It was composed of col. Dietrichstein, provisional marshal of the states; the prelate of Klosterneubourg; the prelate of the Scotch; count Pergen; count Veterani; baron Bartenstein; M. de Mayenberg; baron Hafen, referendary of Lower Saxony; all the members of the state; the archbishop of Vienna; baron Lederer, captain of the town; M. Wohlleben, burghermaster; M. Meher, vice burghermaster; Egger, Pinck, Heisn, counsellors of the municipality. Gen. Andreossy, appointed governor of the city, organised in each suburb a municipality, a central committee of provisions, and a national guard, consisting of merchants, manufacturers, and the good citizens of every class, armed to repress proprietors and evil disposed persons (*pour contenir les propriétaires et les mauvais sujets.*)—The governor general caused a deputation of the eight suburbs to repair to Schoenbrunn. The Emperor charged them to proceed to the city, in order to carry a letter written by major-gen. prince of Neufchatel, to the archduke Maximilian. He recommended the Deputies to represent to the archduke, that if he continued to fire upon the suburbs, and if a single one of the inhabitants lost his life through his arms, this act of frenzy, this crime against the people, would for ever break the bonds which attach subjects to their sovereigns.—The Deputation entered the city on the 11th, at ten in the forenoon, and their arrival was marked only by the redoubled fire from the ramparts. Fifteen inhabitants of the suburbs perished, and only two Frenchmen were killed. The patience of the Emperor was wearied out. He proceeded with the duke of Rivoli to the arm of the Danube which separates the Pratar (the fashionable promenade of Vienna), and ordered two compa-

nies of voltigeurs to occupy a small pavilion on the left bank, in order to cover the raising of a bridge. The battalion of grenadiers which defended the passage was driven back by the voltigeurs, and by the grapeshot of fifteen pieces of artillery. At eight of the evening the pavilion was occupied, and the materials of the bridge collected. Captain Portales, aide-de camp of the prince of Neufchatel, and — Susaldi, aide-de-camp of general Boudet, were among the first to swim across the river, in order to seek the boats on the opposite shore.

[The capitulation follows. It consists of sixteen articles, the substance of which is, that the garrison are permitted to march out with the honours of war; and after having defiled, to lay down their arms on the glacis, and surrender themselves prisoners of war. The officers to retain their property, and the soldiers their haversacks. All the public institutions to continue on the same footing, and the inhabitants to be protected in their properties, privileges, &c. The letter addressed by the prince of Neufchatel to the archduke Maximilian, is appended. It merely requests the archduke, for the sake of humanity, not to persist in his defence, as it would tend to the destruction of the capital and its citizens.]

#### *Eighth Bulletin.*

The people of Vienna praise the archduke Reiner. He was governor of Vienna, but when the revolutionary measures ordered by the emperor Francis II. came to his knowledge, he refused to retain the government. The archduke Maximilian was therefore appointed in his stead. This young prince, who displayed all the thoughtlessness that could be supposed to belong to his age, declared that he would bury himself under the ruins of the town. He collected altogether all the restless, the indolent, and the worthless, of whom there is always a multitude in a great city, furnished them with pikes, and distributed all the arms which were in the arsenal.—In vain did the inhabitants represent to him that a great city, raised by infinite labour and expence to so high a pitch of grandeur, ought not to be exposed to the horrors and devastation with which war is accompanied. Those representations, however, only excited his passion, and his fury rose to such a height that he gave no other answer but the order to fire bombs and howitzers on the suburbs, which could kill the inhabitants only. The French

were protected by their fortifications, and could derive a farther security from the practice of war.—The people of Vienna experienced the most painful anxiety, and the town was believed to be devoted to destruction, when the emperor Napoleon, to save the capital from the evils of a protracted defence, by rendering all defence evidently useless, ordered the troops to cross the arm of the Danube, and to take possession of the Pratar.—At 8 o'clock an officer informed the archduke that a bridge was established at that quarter, that a great number of the French had crossed by swimming, and were already on that side of the river. At this news the hot-headed prince grew pale, and was filled with terror. He passed the Pratar in all haste; sent every battalion he met back by the bridge, and made his escape without having formed any arrangement for the defence of the town, and even without transferring to any person the command which he was abandoning. This however, was the very same man who but an hour before had boldly pretended that he would bury himself under the ruins of the capital.—The fate of the House of Lorraine was foreseen by all intelligent persons, though in other respects of the most opposite opinions. Manfredini obtained an audience of the Emperor, in which he represented to him that this war would long weigh heavy on his conscience, that it would bring about the downfall of his House, and that the French would soon be at Vienna, “Poh! Poh!” replied the Emperor, “they are all in Spain.”—Thugut, in pursuance of the confidence which the Emperor formerly placed in him, took the liberty of making repeated representations.—The prince de Ligne said aloud, “I thought I was old enough not to have outlived the Austrian monarchy.” And when the old count Wallis saw the Emperor set out to join the army, he said, “there is Darius running to meet an Alexander: he will experience the same fate.”—Count Lewis Von Cobentzel, the chief promoter of the war of 1805, was at this time lying on his death-bed; but 24 hours before he expired, he addressed a vigorous and animated letter to the Emperor. “Your majesty,” he wrote, “ought to consider yourself as fortunate with respect to the situation in which the peace of Presburgh has placed you. You are in the second rank among the powers of Europe, which is the same that your ancestors occupied. Avoid a war for which no provocation is given, and which will produce the ruin of

your house. Napoleon will conquer, and will then have the right to be inexorable,” &c. This last act of count Cobentzel rendered his departing moments truly interesting.—The prince of Zizendorf, minister for foreign affairs, several statesmen, who, like him, remained free from the contagion and fatal blindness of the moment; several other persons of distinction, and all that were respectable among the burghers, entertained the same sentiments, and spoke in the same manner.—But the wounded pride of the emperor Francis II., the hatred of the archduke Charles against Russia, and the displeasure with which he viewed the close union between that empire and France, the gold of England, which had purchased the minister Stadion, the levity and inconsiderateness of some dozens of women, or effeminate men, the deceptions and false reports of count Metternich, the intrigues of the Razumowskis, the Dalphozzos, the Schlegels, the Gentzes, and other adventurers, whom England maintains for the purpose of sowing discord on the continent, have promoted this foolish, impious war.—Before the French were victorious in the field, it was said that they were few in number; that there were no more of them in Germany; that the corps consisted entirely of conscripts; that the cavalry were without horses; that the Imperial Guard had mutinied, and that the Parisians were in insurrection against the emperor Napoleon. After we had conquered, however, the French army was innumerable; it never was formed of more veteran or braver troops; the attachment of the soldiers to the emperor Napoleon tripled and quadrupled their force; the cavalry was well mounted, numerous and formidable; the artillery was better served than that of any other nation, and moved with the rapidity of lightning, &c. &c.—Weak princes! Corrupt cabinets! ignorant, fickle, besotted men! Such are the snares which England has these fifteen years constantly spread for you, and into which you will readily fall. But the catastrophe you prepared is at length developed, and the peace of the continent is for ever secured.—Yesterday the Emperor reviewed gen. Nansoutz's division of heavy cavalry. He bestowed much praise on the appearance of this fine division, which, after so severe a campaign, exhibited 5,000 horses in order of battle. His majesty filled up the vacancies by new appointments, and bestowed the title of Baron, with an estate, on the bravest officer, and the decoration of the Legion of Ho-

nour, with 1,200 francs, on the bravest cuirassier of each regiment. We found at Vienna 500 pieces of cannon, a vast number of gun-carriages and muskets, a great quantity of powder, abundance of ready made military accoutrements, and a heap of bullets and cast iron.—Only ten houses were destroyed during the bombardment. The people of Vienna remarked, that this misfortune had justly fallen on those who were the most zealous promoters of the war, and they perceived then that general Andreossy directed the batteries.—The appointment of this general to the government of Vienna, has proved highly satisfactory to all the inhabitants. He had left behind in the capital an honourable recollection, and enjoys the general respect of the people. A few days rest have greatly benefited the army; and the weather is now so fine, we have scarce any sick. The wine distributed to the troops is in abundance, and of excellent quality.—The Austrian government has made astonishing efforts for the support of this war. It is calculated that the preparations have cost above 300 millions in paper money. The mass of bills in circulation exceeds in value 1,500 millions. The court of Vienna has carried off the plates of this sort of assignats, for which a part of the mines of the monarchy are mortgaged, that is to say, their security is a property almost chimerical, and over which the holders of the paper have no controul. While a paper money which the public could not reject, and which daily increased in value, was thus widely multiplied, the court, through the bankers of Vienna, bought up all the gold that could be procured, and sent it to a foreign country. A month has scarcely elapsed since chests full of gold ducats, sealed with the Imperial seal, were forwarded by the north of Germany to Holland.

**ORDER.**—1. The Militia, called the Landwher, is disbanded.—2. A general amnesty is granted to all who belong to the said Militia, and who shall return to their homes at the farthest within 14 days after the entrance of our troops into the territory in which they have been raised.—3. If the officers do not return within the aforesaid time, their houses shall be burnt, and their property declared forfeited.—4. The villages which have furnished men for this Militia, called the Landwher, shall be bound to recal them, and to deliver up the arms they placed in their hands.—5. The commandants of the several provinces are charged with the necessary measures

for the execution of this Decree.—In our Imperial Palace, at Schoenbrunn, May 14.—(Signed) NAPOLEON.—By order of the Emperor, ALEXANDER, Prince of Neuschattel, major-general.

*Ninth Bulletin, dated Vienna, May 19.*

While the army was taking some repose at Vienna; while its corps were re-uniting, and while the Emperor was reviewing the troops, in order to distribute rewards to the brave men who had distinguished themselves, and filling up the vacancies which had occurred, every necessary preparation was made for the important operation of the passage of the Danube.—After the battle of Eckmuhl, prince Charles being driven to the other side of the Danube, had no other refuge than the mountains of Bohemia.—By pursuing the remains of prince Charles's army into the interior of Bohemia, the Emperor might have taken from him his artillery and baggage, but this advantage was not sufficient to counterbalance the hardships to which the army would have been exposed during a march of 14 days, through a miserable, mountainous, and desolate country.—The Emperor adopted no plan which might procrastinate his entrance into Vienna even for a day, as he rightly conjectured, that in the state of excitation which prevailed, it would be attempted to present some obstacles by defending the town, which has a very good breast-work, provided with bastions.—Besides, his army of Italy demanded all his attention, and the idea that the Austrians were in possession of his fine provinces of Friuli and Piave, never permitted him to repose.—The duke of Auerstadt was posted before Ratisbon when prince Charles retreated into Bohemia; but he immediately proceeded by Passau and Lintz to the left bank of the Danube, thus gaining four marches on that Prince. The corps of the prince of Ponte Corvo acted upon a like system, and made a movement towards Egra, which obliged prince Charles to direct the corps of gen. Bellegarde towards the same point; but the prince of Ponte Corvo made a bold counter-march towards Lintz, which he reached before gen. Bellegarde, who being aware of this counter-march had also moved towards the Danube.—These manœuvres, performed from day to day, according to circumstances, have delivered Italy; have thrown the barriers of the Inn, of the Salza, of the Traun, and all the enemy's magazines, out of defence; have reduced Vienna, have

dissolved the militia and the landwher, have completed the overthrow of the corps of the archd. Lewis and gen. Hiller, and have still farther withered the fame of the enemy's general.—This commander being aware of the march of the Emperor, it became necessary for him to make a movement towards Lintz, in order to pass the bridge and unite with the corps of the archd. Lewis and general Hiller. The French army however was there for some days before he could approach to form a junction. He imagined perhaps that he would be able to effect his junction at Krems, but that was a vain hope. He was again four days too late, and gen. Hiller, when he passed the Danube, was obliged to burn the same bridge of Krems. Finally, he hoped to be able to effect a junction at Vienna, but he was once more several days behind.—The Emperor has caused a bridge to be thrown over the Danube, at the village of Ebersdorf, two leagues below Vienna. The river is at this place divided into several branches, and is 400 toises broad. This work was only commenced yesterday at four o'clock in the afternoon. Molitor's division was conveyed across to the left bank, and routed the weak detachments which disputed the ground with it, and attempted to cover the furthest branch of the river.—Generals Butrand and Parnetti are superintending the construction of two bridges, of which one is more than 240, and the other more than 180 toises long, and which communicate in the middle of the river by an island. It is hoped that the works will be finished to-morrow.—All the accounts we receive induce us to believe that the emperor of Austria is at Zanim. There is still no rising in Hungary! In want of arms, saddles, and money, and not much attached to the House of Austria, this nation appears to have refused all kind of assistance.—Gen. Lauriston, his majesty's aid-de-camp, has marched at the head of the Baden infantry, and gen. Colbert's brigade of light cavalry from Neustadt to Brucken on the Simeringberg, which is a high hill dividing the waters that run into the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. In the course of this difficult march he took 100 prisoners.—Gen. Duppellin has marched towards Marinzell. He has disarmed about 1,000 of the landwhers, and made a number of prisoners.—The duke of Dantzig has advanced to Inspruck. At Vorgel on the 14th, he fell in with gen. Chastellar and his Tyrolese, routed him, and took 700 prisoners,

and 11 pieces of cannon.—On the 12th Kufstein was relieved. His majesty's chamberlain, M. Germain, who was shut up in the place, conducted himself with propriety.—The position of the army is at present as follows:—The corps of marshals the dukes of Rivoli and Montebello, and the grenadier corps of general Oudinot, are at Vienna along with the Imperial Guard. Marshal the prince of Ponte Corvo is at Lintz with the Saxons and Wirtemberghers, and has a corps of reserve at Passau. Marshal the duke of Dantzig is with the Bavarians at Salzburg and Inspruck.—Colonel the count of Czernichew, aid-de-camp of the emperor of Russia, who had been sent to Paris, arrived at the head-quarters as the army was entering Vienna. He has since served in the army, and attends on his majesty. He has brought intelligence respecting the Russian army, which was not to break up from its cantonments before the 10th or 12th of this month.

*Tenth Bulletin, dated Ebersdorf, May 23.*

Opposite to Ebersdorf the Danube divides into three branches separated by two islands. The distance from the right bank to the island on that side, which is 140 toises in circumference, is about 1,000 toises. The distance from this island to the greater is 120 toises, and here the stream runs with the greatest force. The larger of the two islands is called In-der-Lobau, and the water which separates it from the main land is 70 toises broad. The first villages which appear after crossing are Gross-Aspern, Esling, and Enzerdorf. The passage of such a river as the Danube, in the presence of an enemy well acquainted with all the local circumstances, and who has the inhabitants on his side, is one of the greatest military enterprises that can be imagined.—The bridge over the arm of the river which separates the right bank from the first island, and the bridge from this island to that of In-der-Lobau, were erected on the 19th. Molitor's division had been conveyed to the great island on the 18th by row boats.—On the 20th the Emperor arrived at In-der-Lobau, and caused a bridge to be thrown over the least arm of the Danube from that island to the left bank, between Gross-Aspern and Esling. This arm being not quite 70 toises broad, only 15 pontoons were required for the operation, which were fixed within three hours by colonel Aubry, of the artillery.—Colonel St. Croix, aid-de-camp of marshal the duke of Rivoli, arrived first on

the left bank, in an open boat, and general Lassalle's division of the light cavalry, with Molitor and Boudet's divisions, passed during the night. Afterwards the Emperor, accompanied by the prince of Neufchâtel, the dukes of Rivoli and Montebello, examined the position of the left bank, and determined the field of battle, posting the right on the village of Esling, and the left on the village of Gross-Aspern. Both villages were likewise garrisoned.—On the 21st, at four in the afternoon, the enemy's army shewed itself, and appeared to have for its object to defeat our van guard, and to drive it into the river. Vain enterprise!—The duke of Rivoli was the first attacked at Gross-Aspern, by the corps of general Bellegarde. He manœuvred with the divisions of Molitor and Legrand, and rendered completely abortive all the attacks which the enemy made that evening. The duke of Montebello defended the village of Esling, and marshaled the duke of Istria covered the plain with the light cavalry and Espagne's division of cuirassiers, protecting at the same time Ewyensdorf; the contest was severe, the enemy having 200 pieces of cannon and 90,000 men, collected from the remains of all the Austrian corps.—D'Espagne's division of cuirassiers, which made several fine charges, advanced in two squares, and took 14 pieces of cannon, but a ball killed gen. D'Espagne while fighting gloriously at the head of his troops. He was a brave man, and in every respect eminent and praiseworthy. The general of brigade Foulard was likewise killed in a charge.—General Nansoutz arrived in the evening on the field of battle, with the single brigade commanded by gen. St. Germain, and distinguished himself by several brilliant charges. At eight o'clock the action terminated, and we remained masters of the field.—During the night, gen. Oudinot's corps, St. Hillaire's division, and two brigades of light cavalry, and the train of artillery, passed over by the bridges.—On the 22d the duke of Rivoli was the first engaged at four in the morning. The enemy made several successive attacks, in order to retake the village. At last the duke of Rivoli, tired of acting on the defensive, attacked the enemy in his turn, and threw them into confusion. Gen. Legrand distinguished himself by the coolness and intrepidity which characterise him.—The general of division Boudet was stationed at the village of Esling, and had had orders to defend that important position.—Observing, that the

enemy occupied a very wide space between his right and left wing, it was resolved to penetrate by his centre. The duke of Montebello led the attack. Gen. Oudinot was on the left, St. Hillaire's division was on the centre, and Boudet's division was on the right wing. The enemy's centre would not withstand the sight of our troops.—In a moment every thing was borne down before them. The duke of Istria made several brilliant and successful attacks. Three columns of infantry were charged and cut down by the cuirassiers. The Austrian army was on the point of being destroyed, when at seven in the morning an aid-de-camp of the Emperor came to inform him that the sudden rise of the Danube had set afloat a great number of trees, which were cut down during the late events at Vienna, and rafts which had been left on the bank; and that the bridges which formed the communication between the right bank and the little island, and between the little island and that of In-der-Lobau, had thereby been carried away. This rapid swell, which usually does not take place until the middle of June on the melting of the snow, has been accelerated by the great heat which has for some days prevailed. All the reserve parks of artillery which where advancing, were by the loss of the bridges detained on the right bank, as was also a part of our heavy cavalry, and the whole of the duke of Auerstadt's corps. This dreadful accident induced the Emperor to put a stop to the movement in advance. He ordered the duke of Montebello to keep the field of battle which had been won, and then to take his position, with the left wing resting on a curtain-work, which the duke of Rivoli covered, and his right wing at Esling.—The artillery and infantry cartridges which were in our reserve park could not now be brought across the river. The enemy was in a most frightful state of disorder at the moment, when he learned that our bridges were broken down. The slackening of our fire, and the concentrating movement of our army, soon left him no doubt respecting this unforeseen accident. All his cannon and artillery equipage, which were before on the retreat, were again drawn out in line, and from nine in the morning to seven in the evening he made most astonishing exertions, supported by the fire of 200 pieces of cannon, to throw the French army into disorder; but all his efforts tended to his own disgrace. Thrice he attacked the villages of Esling

and Gross-Aspern, and thrice he filled them with his dead. The fusiliers of the guards, commanded by general Monton, acquired great glory; they defeated the reserve, formed of all the grenadiers of the Austrian army, and the only fresh troops which remained to the enemy. Gen. Gros put to the sword 700 Hungarians, who had succeeded in entrenching themselves in the church-yard of Esling. The tirailleurs under the command of gen. Curiel, performed their first service this day, and proved that they possessed courage. Gen. Dorsenne, col. commandant of the old guards, posted his troops in the third line, forming a brazen wall, which was alone capable of withstanding all the efforts of the Austrian army. The enemy discharged 40,000 cannon shot against us, while we, deprived of our reserve parks, were under the necessity of sparing our ammunition, lest some other unforeseen events should occur.—In the evening, the enemy returned to his old position, which he had left previous to the commencement of the attack, and we remained masters of the field. His loss is very great: it being estimated by the most experienced officers that he left more than 12,000 dead on the field. According to the reports of the prisoners the enemy have had 23 generals and 60 superior officers killed or wounded. Lieut. field marshal Weber and 1,500 men, and four standards, have fallen into our hands. Our loss has also been considerable. We have 1,100 killed and 3,000 wounded.—The duke of Montebello was wounded by a cannon ball in the thigh, at six o'clock in the evening of the 22d; but an amputation has taken place, and his life is out of danger. At first it was thought that he was killed, and being carried on a hand-barrow to where the Emperor was, his adieu was most affecting. In the midst of all the anxieties of the day the Emperor gave himself up to the expression of that tender friendship which during so many years he has cherished for this brave companion in arms. Some tears rolled from his eyes, and turning to those who surrounded him, he said, "My heart required such a painful stroke as this, to make me occupy myself, on this day, with any other care than that of my army." The duke of Montebello was insensible, but recovered himself in the presence of the Emperor: he embraced him and said, "Within an hour you will have lost him who dies with the glory and the consolation of being your best friend."—The general of division, St. Hilaire, is also

wounded; he is one of the first generals of France. Gen. Durosnel, aid-de-camp to the Emperor, was also killed by a cannon-ball, while he was carrying an order.—The soldiers displayed all that coolness and intrepidity which is peculiar to the French only.—The water of the Danube still increasing, the bridges of the Danube could not be restored during the night; the Emperor, therefore, ordered the army, on the 23d, to pass from the left bank across the little arm, and take a position in the island of In-der-Lobau, protecting the *têtes du ponte*.—The works for replacing the bridge are continued with assiduity, and nothing will be undertaken until they are secure, not only against the accidents of the water, but against any thing that may be attempted against them. The rise of the river, and the rapidity of the stream, must require much labour and great caution.—On the 23d, when the army was informed that the Emperor had ordered it to retreat to the great island, nothing could exceed the astonishment of the brave troops; victorious on both days, they had supposed that the remainder of the army had joined them; but when they were told that the high water had carried away the bridges, and that its continued increase rendered the renewal of their ammunition and provisions impracticable, and that any movement in advance would be absurd, it was with great difficulty they could be persuaded of the truth of the statement.—That bridges constructed of the largest boats of the Danube, secured by double anchors and cables, should be carried away, was a great and entirely unforeseen disaster; but it was extremely fortunate that the Emperor was not two hours later of being informed of it. The army in pursuing the enemy would have exhausted its ammunition, which it would have been impossible to replace.—On the 23d a great quantity of ammunition was sent to the camp at In-der-Lobau.—The battle of Esling, of which a circumstantial report shall be made, pointing out the brave men who distinguished themselves therein, will, in the eyes of posterity, be a new memorial of the glory and inflexible firmness of the French army.—The marshals the dukes of Montebello and Rivoli on that day displayed all the powers of their military character.—The Emperor has given the command of the 2d corps to gen. count Oudinot, a general tried in a hundred battles, in which he has always evinced the possession of equal courage as skill.

*Eleventh Bulletin, dated Ebersdorf, May 21.*

The duke of Dantzig is master of the Tyrol, and entered Innspruck on the 19th, the whole territory having submitted.—On the 11th the duke of Dantzig took the strong position of the Strub-pass, with seven cannon and 600 men.—On the 13th, after defeating Chasteller in the position of Voergel, putting him to flight, and taking all his artillery, he pursued him near to Rullenberg, where the wretched fugitive was indebted for his safety only to the speed of his horse.—General De Roy at the same time raised the blockade of the fortress of Kufstein, forming his junction with the troops commanded by the duke of Dantzig, who greatly praises the conduct of general Palm and several other officers (named in the Bulletin).—Chasteller entered the Tyrol with a handful of brave men, and preached up insurrection, plunder, and murder. He saw several thousand Bavarians and a hundred French soldiers put to death before his eyes. He even encouraged the murders by his own applause, and provoked all the cruelty of these mountain boors. Among the murdered French were about sixty Belgians, all countrymen of Chasteller. That wretch, loaded with the favours of the Emperor, to whom he owed the restoration of his property, amounting to several millions, is insusceptible to the feelings of gratitude, as well as to the affection which even barbarians entertain for their countrymen.—The Tyrolese detest the man whose treacherous conduct instigated them to rebellion, and who thereby brought upon them all its consequent evils. The rage against Chasteller is so great, that when after what happened at Voergel he took refuge at Hall, they attacked him with cudgels, and gave him such a drubbing that he kept his bed for two days, and durst not venture to make his appearance, except to request a capitulation: he was told, however, that no capitulation would be granted to a highway robber, upon which he fled towards the mountains of Carinthia.—The valley of Zillertal was the first which submitted, laid down arms, and gave hostages. The remainder of the territory has followed this example. All the chiefs have ordered the boors to return to their homes, and they are leaving the mountains and returning to their villages. The town of Innspruck and all the villages have

sent deputies to the king of Bavaria to offer pledges of their fidelity, and to supplicate his mercy.—The Vorarlburghers, who have been misled by the exasperating proclamations and artifices of the enemy, will follow the example of the Tyrol, and that part of Germany will then be completely freed from all the horrors and misfortunes of popular insurrection.

*Twelfth Bulletin, dated Ebersdorf, May 26.*

On the 23rd and 24th the army was employed to restore the bridges, which were ready the 25th, early in the morning, and the wounded, caissons, &c. were removed to the right banks of the Danube.—The Danube being likely to rise until the 15th of June, it is intended to mark the heights of the river by poles driven into the ground, to which the large iron chain is to be fastened which the Turks had destined for the same purpose, but the Austrians took it from them, and it was found in the arsenal of Vienna. This measure, and the works which are constructed on the left bank of the Danube, will enable us to manoeuvre on both sides of that river. Our light troops have taken post near Presburgh, on the lake of Neusiedel. Gen. Lauriston is in Styria, at Simeringsberg and Bruck. The duke of Dantzig is hastening, by forced marches, at the head of the Bavarian troops, to join the army of Vienna; the horse-chasseurs of the imperial guard arrived here yesterday; the dragoons were expected in the course of the day; and within a few days the horse-grenadiers, and 60 pieces of ordnance attached to the guards, will reach this place.—By the Capitulation of Vienna, seven marshal-lieutenants, nine major-generals, 10 colonels, 20 majors and lieutenant-colonels, 100 captains, 150 lieutenants, 200 second lieutenants, and 3,000 non-commissioned officers and soldiers were made prisoners of war, exclusively of those who were in the hospital, and whose numbers amount to some thousands.

**BATTLE OF URFAR.**—On the 17th inst. at two in the afternoon, three Austrian columns, under the command of generals Grainville, Bucowitz, and Somma Riva, and supported by a reserve under gen. Jellachich, attacked gen. Vandamme at the village of Urfar, in the front of the bridge-head at Lintz.

(To be continued.)

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 25.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 24, 1809.

[Price 1s.

"THE defect of Representation is the national Disease; and, unless you apply a Remedy directly to that Disease, you must inevitably take the Consequences, with which it is pregnant.—Without a Parliamentary Reform the Nation will be plunged into new wars; without a Parliamentary Reform you cannot be safe against bad Ministers, nor can even good Ministers be of use to you. *No honest man* can, according to the present system, *continue Minister.*"—MR. PITT'S SPEECH, in the House of Commons, 1782.

961] [962]

## PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

WHEN the reader has perused the motto, and observed the date, it will, doubtless, occur to him, that this same man, without a Reform in Parliament, became minister, and *continued to be minister for nearly twenty years.* The truth is, that, if there had been that Reform of Parliament, which he professed to wish for, and which profession, together with others of a similar tendency, gained him that popularity of which he made so mischievous an use; if that Reform of Parliament had taken place, he would very soon have ceased to be minister, or he would never have thought of those measures, by which, in one shape or another, the half of every man's estate has been taken from him, while the number of paupers has been doubled.—What we have recently seen; what has now been placed before us in so many shapes; what we have now seen so clearly proved; this must remove from every mind, any doubt that might exist, respecting the soundness, or unsoundness, of Mr. Pitt's doctrine, "that no honest man can, according to the present system, *continue minister.*"—Mr. Curwen's Bill, of which I have spoken in the two last Numbers, has passed: it is become a law, and it contains only *three lines and a half* of the bill, as originally proposed by Mr. Curwen. It was clearly shown, I think, in my Number of the 10th of June, that this bill, even in its best state; even as proposed by Mr. Curwen, would only throw the monopoly of seats into the hands of the Treasury. We need not wonder, therefore, that good Mr. Curwen had the gratification of seeing Mr. Perceval and Lord Castlereagh amongst his most zealous supporters. If the worthy Mr. Reding had been in the House, I dare say that Mr. Curwen would have been honoured with his support too.—But, the Opposition; I mean the *regular* Opposition, voted against the bill. They voted against the throwing

of this monopoly into the hands of the Treasury; and, *why* did they so? Because, *they themselves had not the possession of the Treasury.* This was a very sufficient reason for them to oppose the monopoly; especially as they must have perceived, that the monopoly, if turned to good account by the present set, would deprive them of all chance of getting into the enjoyment of place and profit again for the remainder of many of their lives, if the system continued so long. This was *their* reason for opposing the bill, as new-modelled by the Tinman's Prosecutor.—During the last debate upon this bill, Sir FRANCIS BURDETT gave notice of his intention to move a Resolution upon the subject of *real Reform*; and, at the same time, to state distinctly what was the sort of Reform that he wished for.—The SPEECH, which he made upon the occasion of this Resolution, I am now about to insert, as made out from the notes of a very able short-hand writer; so that the public may look upon it as containing a perfectly correct statement of all that was said by Sir Francis Burdett upon this occasion.—Here, then, we have *his* Plan of Reform. We have an exposition of the principles upon which that Plan is founded; and we have arguments undeniable as to its beneficial effects.—Any further than in observing, that this Plan, as to all its material parts, is precisely that which I wish for, and which every man not interested, either directly or indirectly, in public robbery, will, upon taking time to consider, heartily wish for; any further than this I shall not, at present, take up the time of the reader with any thing upon the nature or tendency of the Plan; but, there are some circumstances attending the bringing it forward, which it is proper to notice, and which will not fail to have due weight upon the mind of the public.—It was on Monday, the 12th instant, that, in speaking upon Mr. Curwen's bill, Sir Francis Burdett gave notice of his intended motion;

which notice he introduced thus : He said " that the honourable Mover, who originally introduced the Bill, could, in its present state, scarcely acknowledge it as his measure. His, indeed, must be a mobility of political feeling, if, so metamorphosed, he could recognise it as his own, melted down as it had been so completely, in the crucible of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. By whom was it supported ? What influence, under those changes, which some would affect to call improvements, now recommended it to the sanction of the House ? Strange to tell, this measure of *Reform*, this remedy for existing evils, this, which in its operation was to have the powerful effect of preventing their recurrence, was now recommended, fostered, and improved by the very persons who either had committed, were accused of committing, or by their votes in that House, had sanctioned the very criminal transactions and offences against the principles of the Constitution and the independence of Parliament, which this very Bill, so supported, now went to remedy and redress. Could the House forget what was the nature of the plea, when such transactions were offered to be proved at its bar ?—when the very author of this Bill, for so changed, so perverted was it from its original import, that he could not call it any longer the measure of the honourable gentleman behind him (Mr. Curwen), had himself been accused of conniving at such an offence—when his noble colleague (lord Castle-reagh) near him had from his own lips been self-convicted—when indeed, from every side of the house justification and not corrective, was the tenor of individual sentiment and of general discussion. And in what did that justification consist ? It was only to be found in the extensiveness of this great constitutional offence. Now, it did happen, that in our Courts of criminal jurisprudence, where the ignorant and the poor and the wretched had to answer for their misdeeds, that those very crown lawyers who here defended that crime upon its extensiveness and its frequency, converted that very frequency and extensiveness, in the former case, into an aggravation of the crime, and into an additional argument for the propriety of conviction and the necessity of a severe punishment. Had the house, when such offences were directly charged against individuals, heard any such constitutional doctrine from those whose situations bound them to deliver it ? No,

" no. Neither direct accusation, neither acknowledged frequency and admitted extensiveness, had produced any effect, until the evil itself, and the source from whence it emanated, became too evident to be longer concealed from the people or protected by those interested. And what, after all, was the remedy ?—A measure in its origin far from being effe- fectual, but, under its present modifica- tions, only what he must repeat, *an indemnity for past offences and a security for future corruptions.*" —After this he gave the notice before-mentioned, observing, that it would be scandalous, to the last de- gree, for the house to separate without giving some pledge to the country, that they would seriously take the question of Reform into their consideration as soon as they met again.—His notice was for the Wednesday, and, it so happened, that, though there was much business to press forward, there were not members enough present to make what is called a House, so that the motion could not be made. If the notice had been renewed, the like might have happened again ; and thus, when the last day of the session came, the motion and the speech might have been prevented by a rap at the door by the Black Rod. This the mover prevented by taking care to attend every day, and the first moment he caught the House formed for business, rising and making his speech and motion.—When men are conscious of their own inferiority of talents, or of the badness of their cause, they naturally keep aloof : they decline, they shun, they flee from discussion. When this Speech of Sir Francis Burdett came to be made, and when the public saw what Mr. Perceval had to say in answer, the cause of there being no House to hear the motion was evident enough. It was impossible to let the thing go off ; it was impossible to negative such a motion without saying something ; very little could be said, and, therefore, it was best not to make a House, and, if possible, not to let the people hear what Sir Francis Burdett had to propose as a Plan for Parliamentary Reform.—This, however, has not succeeded. We have now the principal parts of that Plan before us ; and, if we approve of it, the way for us to shew that approbation, is, by petitioning the King to recommend the measure to the parliament.—In my next, it is my intention to consider this plan of the Honourable Baronet in detail, and to see how it would act, if put into movement. The principles upon which the Plan is

founded are admirably displayed in the Speech, and they cannot be too attentively considered; but, it will be useful for us to see how the plan itself will *operate*; how it will *work*; how it will be carried into execution.—Having made these introductory observations, I shall now insert the Speech, subjoining to it an account of the numbers upon the division, and a list of the minority.—This appears to me to be the first great direct step towards the demolition of that system of corruption, which has so long been gnawing at the heart of the country, and which, thanks chiefly to Mr. Wardle, has been of late, so well exposed; and, I trust, that, at no great distance of time, we shall have to trace a Reform from this first step to the completion.

## S P E E C H

OF

SIR F. BURDETT, BART.

IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, JUNE 15, 1809,

ON A

## REFORM OF THAT HOUSE.

SIR;

I rise to offer to the attention of the house a Plan of Reform, not for its immediate adoption, but for its future consideration; to state my opinion to the house, and the public, upon this subject, and to propose to the house to come to a Resolution (according to frequent custom at the close of a session), the object of which is, to hold out an assurance to the country, that the house will, at an early period in the next session, take into its consideration the necessity of a Reform in the State of the Representation.

This course I am urged, amongst other reasons, to adopt, in order to get rid of the misrepresentation (unintentional I am willing to believe) which has been so long, and so actively propagated, with regard to my views and opinions on this momentous point: the mischievous tendency of which misrepresentations, as affecting myself personally, would alone have very little influence upon my mind; but it has much, combined with the public interest. As involved in this most essential question, I therefore feel it a duty to myself and the public to relieve this subject from all misrepresentation, ambiguity, and misconception: and in now proposing for discussion, but not for immediate adoption, the outline of a specific Plan, I am answering those repeated calls which have been

made upon me in this house, to state to this house, and to the public, definitely and precisely, what my views are upon the subject (perpetually agitated) of Parliamentary Reform, that henceforward it may be fully and clearly understood, how far I do really mean to go, and at what point I mean to stop.

This is a subject which has long engaged my most anxious attention; and though I very early stated my opinion respecting it, that opinion was not thoughtlessly formed, or rashly hazarded; but after the most diligent inquiry, and minute investigation. If I did not then offer it to the public attention without due reflection, still less did it originate in those views and mischievous motives, to which it has been falsely ascribed—a desire to excite discontent, and to agitate the public mind by exaggerated statements of undefined grievances, beyond the reach of practical constitutional redress. I am ready to admit, if such were the case, that my conduct would be as culpable as those who most misrepresent it, would wish it to be considered; and I am willing to confess, that to excite discontent in the public mind by fixing its eye upon necessary and unavoidable evils, beyond the power of remedy, would be as exceptionable and dishonest a proceeding, as to mislead them from their true remedy, and obstinately to withhold that easy redress which the Constitution so clearly points out, and so amply affords.

In this case, I shall cautiously abstain from any exaggeration of public grievance, or any expression calculated to excite in any gentleman, or set of gentlemen, the slightest irritation, or asperity of feeling; it being my wish, that the question should stand on its own merits, that it should be coolly and candidly considered, and that it should be the subject, not of angry contention, but of fair discussion. At the same time, there are some doctrines and opinions which have been recently promulgated in this house, of so misleading and mischievous a tendency, that I cannot allow myself to pass them over altogether without some animadversion.

The course I have prescribed for myself is to state the Evils arising out of the defective state of the Representation, and then to point out the Remedy, which is simple, and perfectly practicable, not only consistent with the habits and interests of the people, and in unison with the laws and constitution of the country, but is (as I think I can shew) the *Constitution itself*:

—Let others deal in whimsical speculations, in undefined mysterious notions of a Constitution, which eludes the grasp, and soars above the conception of ordinary minds, let them amuse themselves with intricate theories and fine-spun metaphysics, whilst I shall hold fast by that plain and substantial Constitution, adapted to the contemplation of common understandings, to be found in the Statute Book, and recognized by the Common Law of the Land.—If it can be shown that the principles on which I proceed are erroneous, unconstitutional, and inconsistent with the ancient, fundamental laws of England, I shall stand corrected, and willingly abandon my proposition; but if, on the contrary, I shall be able to demonstrate, that the present system is the creature of innovation, and a departure from the old, established, un-repealed laws of the country, and that a recurrence to the practice of these laws, is an easy and adequate remedy for the evil, though I may not indulge a hope of the concurrence of this house, yet I may hope for the approbation of the public, and, at all events, I shall enjoy the satisfaction of knowing that I have performed an essential duty, both to the people and myself, in bringing forward the present inquiry.

Before I proceed to the consideration of the subject more immediately before the house, I think proper to make some remarks upon those very extraordinary doctrines to which I have before alluded.—It has been asserted, that Corruption is not only a part of our Constitution—that it was not only necessary and to be tolerated, but (as it should seem) that the Constitution was to be tolerated for the sake of the Corruption. We have heard it seriously alledged, that without the auxiliary of Corruption in this house the Constitution would be insecure, that the Government could not be carried on. It has been described as “growing with our growth, and “strengthening with our strength;” it had been more consolatory to have been informed, that it decayed with our decay and diminished with our decrease. One can hardly conceive a more unhappy quotation for the purposes of those who have made the allusion. What is it the poet speaks of, when he says it

“Grows with our growth, and strengthens with our strength?”

It is a state of disease necessarily terminating in final dissolution.

“The young disease, which must subdue at length,  
“Grows with our growth, and strengthens with our strength.”

It applies strongly, indeed, in favour of those who call for some Remedy to arrest the progress of destruction, for some stimulus to re-invigorate the Constitution and save it from decay, by extirpating the vile and loathsome cancer of Corruption, which preying upon the vitals, palsies the energies, and consumes the substance, of the country.—The various and contradictory arguments by which this Corruption has been attempted to be defended challenge particular observation: at one time it has been alledged to be so trifling as to be unworthy of our notice, it is represented then as “mere cheese-parings and candle-ends.” It may, however, be worth remarking (by the bye) an old English proverb to be found in Ray’s Collection, which says “all the King’s cheese goes in parings,” and if a cheese is cut straight through the middle it is all parings; whilst at other times these cheese-parings assume a shape so formidable as to render any attempt to diminish them fruitless and unavailing; so that, inconsistent in argument, consistent in principle, the defenders of Corruption, as it suits their purpose, either represent it as a pigmy beneath notice, or a giant not to be contended with: from which alternate modes of defence we are forced to infer, that in the minds of some gentlemen, Corruption, be it small or be it great, is not only not to be checked or controlled, but to be fostered and encouraged. We are to hug our disease, and doat on dissolution: But so very opposite is my idea upon this subject, that I say, be Corruption small or great, let it assume what form or shape it may, it is an intolerable evil; in the first stage of it I would have said, “Principis obsta;” at our high tide of it I will exclaim, “Ne plus ultra,” that delay is death. The question now is, How the career of this Destroyer is to be arrested? In my opinion, there is no way of doing this with effect, but a *Reform of this House.*

Another doctrine equally mischievous as the former, which it was triumphantly said no human creature could contradict, was that of all men acting from *Mixed Motives*. This may be a convenient doctrine for public men, but, I trust, will appear as unfounded and indefensible as the arguments just alluded to in support of Corruption, either on account of its supposed insignificance or real magnitude: its object and bearing is, in fact, to cut up all morality by the very roots; there could be no rational ground for confidence or esteem, were such a doctrine once admitted; if

all men are supposed to act from *Mixed Motives*, how can any man's character be known? How ascertain the proportion (upon which all depends) of good and bad in the mixture? How discover from what motive any action springs, or whether to be attributed to it praise or censure?—From the confidence and boldness with which this extraordinary doctrine has been advanced, it may seem hazardous to risk a refutation of it; I shall nevertheless attempt to shew that the reverse is the fact, and that, so far from men acting generally from mixed motives, they never act so at all; and however metaphysical may be the notions of some gentlemen, I defy them, with all their refinement and subtlety, to produce a mixture of motives in their own minds. Motives are as impossible to mix as parallel lines to meet. Many motives, it is true, may concur to impel a man to one act, as many roads may lead to one town; many rivers direct their courses to one sea, but they are not on that account mixed. Avarice, ambition, love of country, may conduce to one end; though one of these passions may predominate, the motives remain unmixed; but when put in opposition one to the other, the impossibility of mixing them becomes apparent, the strongest motive overcomes the rest.—The position is quite unphilosophical, and the idea of mixed motives altogether absurd. Surely, no one will call in question the doctrine of a ruling passion, strong even in death, to which we see and daily hear of men offering themselves up willing victims. As our senses, though they may be affected all together, are still distinct, in like manner our minds, though they may be affected at one and the same time by more motives than one, yet do they remain unmixed. But there may be a great convenience in adopting this doctrine of Mixed Motives, similar to that experienced some time since in keeping *mixed accounts*; such mixture serving to create confusion and avert detection. I defy any man, however, to shew that such a doctrine is reconcileable either with morality or logic.

There is one other doctrine, which cannot be passed over without animadversion, equally dangerous, in my mind, with the foregoing ones. It has been held, that whilst the *forms* of the Constitution remained, there was something so excellent in the *mere forms*, that not only was the possession of them of the highest value, but a hope was thereby justified of an amelioration of the state of the country. My

opinion is directly the reverse of this, in which I am supported by the authority of the greatest historians and writers upon political subjects; who have uniformly laid it down, that of all tyrannies a legislative tyranny exercised under the *forms* of a free government, is the most tremendous and fatal; because without hope of remedy.

Tacitus, whose penetration and ability will not be disputed, depicting the melancholy condition of the Roman Empire, under that relentless tyrant Tiberius, describes it as most deplorable, not only on account of flagitious acts proceeding from hypocrisy and despotism united, but still more so on account of its hopeless condition, whilst under the mask of freedom, uncontrollable power was exercised, because that cruel tyranny was carried on under the *forms* of the ancient constitution. There was still a Senate debating, Consuls appointed, and tribunes of the people, and all the *Forms* of the ancient republic studiously preserved; and by how much the more those forms served as a cloke to hide the odious features of despotic power, by so much the more was it terrible, irresistible, and severe: “*Quantoque maiore,*” says Tacitus, “*libertatis imagine tegebantur, tanto irruptura ad infinitus servitum;*” therefore, I am not at all disposed to be satisfied with the *forms*, when the *spirit and essence* of the Constitution have fled.—We have been reminded of the old fable of the Stag and the Horse, introduced with the view, as it should seem, of warning the people against throwing themselves into the arms of one power, in order to avoid falling into those of another. The application of this fable could not be mistaken; it meant, that the People should not seek to ally themselves with the Crown, in order to rid themselves of the grievance of a corrupt House of Commons. To that warning I cannot lend an ear, having no dread of the Prerogative of the Crown; which I know forms part of the law of the land, and is material and necessary to maintain the Constitution. *My only apprehension is, from the usurpation of the legitimate Prerogative, by the Borough Monger Faction, and the consequent abuse of it by the agents of that Faction; untruly styling themselves Ministers of the King, Servants of the Crown, through the medium of this House falsely denominating itself the Representative of the People.*—My desire, therefore, is to erect a barrier against such usurpation and abuse, by a restoration of the fair balance of the Constitution, by giving to each branch its lawful right: thus, providing at once for the defence of the Prerogative of

the Crown, and the protection of the undoubted unalienable Rights of the People: and I think there is no difficulty in shewing that they go well together, that one is in trust for the protection of the other, and that in consequence of their having been separated, contrary to the principles and in violation of the ancient usage of our Constitution, those abuses of which the people now complain first crept in, and being once admitted have made such rapid and tremendous strides towards our destruction; in the midst of which, *all the specious forms* of our Constitution have been studiously observed — Thus, as in Rome, *the observance of forms*, instead of being valuable, as securing any benefit, or justifying any hope, serves only to aggravate the mischief, by adding hypocrisy to despotism, and to embitter the sufferings by deluding and mocking the people.—I must not be misunderstood—no person is more anxious than myself, for the retention and maintenance of those forms; my wish is, to have *the substance also*, that the people may not be any longer duped by appearances which serve only to perpetuate the cheat.

A charge has been made by the abettors of Corruption against those who wish for Reform, as *innovators* and subverters of the Constitution of the country, whereas, the sole object of us Reformers is, *to rescue the country from the effects of the innovation that has been introduced*. Those who speak so much of innovation seem to forget what the great Lord Bacon has said, that “of all innovators time is the greatest.” Will you, then, while all things are changing around you, determine to stand still? Will you still cling to a Rotten-borough System, the creature of innovation, nursed by usurpation, and matured by corruption? for such shall I shew it to be. Is it reasonable that sovereignty should be attached to particular spots and places, and to convert into *Private Property*, that which the Constitution has declared to be *a Public Trust*—to permit an usurped local sovereignty, independent of the King, independent of the People, and destructive to both.—The Prerogative of the Crown, had it been maintained free from encroachments, would never have suffered this anomaly, this ill-shaped monster, this Rotten-borough System, at once formidable and contemptible, to have undermined the Constitution. During the whole course of our history, from the time of William the Conqueror to that of William the Third, down to which the legitimate prerogative of the crown was exercised by the King, no such

absurdity was conceived as a Rotten-borough Parliament.—That part of the Prerogative to issue Writs to such places as were judged from time to time, according to their importance, most fit to send proper and discreet persons to the Common Council of the nation, was a most wise and salutary provision in the code of the Constitution, and well calculated to prevent the occurrence of those evils of which, so loudly and with so great reason, we at this day complain.—Can we suppose that any King in the possession of his just Prerogative, would have thought of addressing a Writ, when he was exercising that great function of his prerogative, the assembling the Great Council of the nation, to Rotten-boroughs? or that it would have been endured if he had? The King’s writs run, “*ad Proceres et Dominos et Communes Regni*,” under which description no Rotten-borough could be included. Can it be imagined that St. Mawes, the posts of Gatton, or the stones of Midhurst, would have been required to send wise and discreet burgesses to assist with their advice in the Great Council of the Nation? James the First, on his accession to the throne, upon summoning the parliament, wisely exercised this prerogative by issuing a Proclamation, forbidding the sending writs to decayed boroughs\*; nor was it till the prerogatives of the Crown were encroached upon at the era of the Revolution, when the seeds of this Rotten-borough System, which have since grown so luxuriantly, and have produced such poisonous effects, the baneful influence of which we now so sensibly feel, were with woeful prodigality first scattered over the land, that the Country was deprived of that corrective wisely lodged in the hands of the Crown by the Constitution, for its preservation against the unavoidable innovations of time, whilst the people, artfully led to ascribe all the evils of the two former reigns to Prerogative alone, willingly acquiesced in its retrenchment—in which they made a fatal mistake, a mistake originating in the idea that they extended their own Liber-

\* “ Next, that all the Sheriffs be charged that they do not direct any Precept for electing and returning of any Burgesses to or for any ancient Borough within their Counties, being so utterly ruined and decayed, that there are not sufficient resyantes to make such choice, and of whom lawful election may be made.” See Cobbett’s Parliamentary History, vol. i. p. 969.

ties in proportion as they curtailed the Prerogative of the Crown—an ingredient in the Constitution as essential to its existence, as is an uncorrupt, full and fair Representation of the People in this House.

Had the constitutional power of the Crown remained undiminished, this House would not now be in its present contaminated state, the just and great prerogative of the Crown would have been exercised beneficially, and given the King his proper weight in the administration of national affairs, whilst the People would have a shield—and a shield and not a sword is all the people expect, in an uncorrupted and fairly elected House of Commons.—This I take to be the Constitution of England—but out of this usurpation upon the crown, conspiring with the innovations of time, a third power has arisen, that of the *Borough-mongers*—the creature of innovation, the worm of corruption, always unknown to our laws, now become greater than the laws, equally hostile to King and People, misrepresenting one to the other, filling the mind of one with jealousy, the ears of the other with alarm, which, by perpetuating discord, reigns sole arbiter of the strife, and establishes its ignominious dominion over both.—My first object, therefore, is, *to reunite the King and the People, by the constitutional bond of Allegiance on the one hand, and Protection on the other.*

"The wisdom of our laws," says Lord Coke, "is most apparent in this, that any departure from their established principles, although at the time wearing the specious appearance of advantage, never fails to bring along with it, such a train of unforeseen inconveniences, as to demonstrate their excellence and the necessity of again having recurrence to them." And, how strikingly that observation is exemplified in the consequences which have followed the departure from the principles of the Constitution, which has led to the establishment of this grievous Borough-monger System: the inconsistency of which with the principles of our laws and institutions, so glaring in the terms of the Writs of Elections, as in every other point of view, no one can dispute. The simple principle upon which, as upon a pivot, the whole of this subject of Representation turns, is this; that the free subjects of this kingdom have a Right of Property in their own goods; in other words, that the People of England cannot be legally and constitutionally taxed without their own consent.—I suppose this will not be denied; and yet it is equally

indisputable, that this principle is absolutely annihilated by the present frame of the Representation of this House, to which a Petition on your table offers to prove, that one hundred and fifty-seven individuals have the power of returning a majority; so that the whole property of the free subjects of this kingdom is, in violation of this first and plain principle, at the disposal of 157 Borough mengers, or in other words, 157 Borough-mongers have usurped, and hold as private property, the sovereignty of England—and can we be satisfied with this miserable, pitiful substitution for the King and Constitution?—Can the People remain contented with the legislation of such a power?—Impossible. Believe me, Sir, the discontent that exists in this country, arises principally from the certain knowledge the People now have of the corrupt state of this House, and their exclusion from that share in the Constitution to which they are by law intitled, that they are not fairly, nor indeed at all represented,—in fact, that the interests of this House are not identified with, but opposite to theirs—remove this defect, repair this great injury, and the advantages will be immediate and important; the People will then believe, that all that is practicable for their benefit will be done, and from that conviction they will naturally be reconciled to those evils, which they would see a disposition to alleviate, and a mutual interest to redress.

Every part of the Empire will feel the benefit of the Reform; but no where will the great advantages of the measure be likely to prove more salutary than in that most interesting part of the empire—Ireland. From the deep interest I take in the concerns of that country, from my idea of its mighty importance, have I reserved the mention of it till last; though the consideration of the manner in which I could devote my best service to it has never been out of my mind, never till now did it mature any practicable plan, calculated to give universal satisfaction to that generous, that insulted people, with perfect security to the state. If Reform is necessary here, it applies much more forcibly there; indeed, the peculiar situation of that country makes it a measure of imperious necessity.—On the subject of Ireland I can hardly speak, from the fear of trespassing on the rule I had laid down for my conduct upon this occasion. I dare not venture to trust myself with the grievances of Ireland. It is a subject I cannot discuss without a more considera-

ble degree of warmth, than is consistent with that dispassionate line of conduct I am upon this occasion particularly anxious to maintain. My desire is to have Ireland united with this country upon terms, however, very different from those which at present exist. I should wish to see there a perfect equality of advantage, and no exclusions. Of the present Union, so called, I shall speak but little at this time: suffice it to say, that it was a measure contrary to the wishes, repugnant to the interest, revolting to the feelings of that nation; and effected by means the most flagitious, if the most unblushing corruption on the part of the agents, and the breach of every solemn assurance to the great body of that people, not only implied but expressed by the government of that country, deserve the appellation. Instead of that parchment Union, I shall propose a real Union of heart and affection, founded on the broad basis of the Constitution, of equal rights, and reciprocal interests.— Away with that crooked policy, that narrow-minded bigotry of legislation, that intolerable intolerance, which keeps alive perpetual heart-burnings, hatred, and revenge. I wish not to dwell upon this system; it is high time to put an end to it.—Is it to be any longer endured, that four millions of Irishmen should be aliens and outlaws in their native land? Is it safe to have four millions of the people thrust out of the pale of the Constitution? Is it consistent with reason, with common sense, putting justice out of the question, any longer to tolerate such a system? By the adoption of Reform, the government will have the fairest opportunity of removing the principal grounds of dissatisfaction in Ireland; now will be the time to do every thing without yielding any thing, to legislate upon enlarged principles, knowing nothing of particular parties, sects, or factions; keeping alive no distinctions of Catholic, Protestant, and Presbyterian, Tory, Whig, or Jacobin; alarming no prejudice, insulting no party, they may now include the whole within one bond of union of the Constitution, embracing and ensuring the safety and tranquillity of the empire at large.— We shall then, and not till then, have an United Kingdom—one King—one People.— We shall by this recurrence to the Constitution, not only seat the Chief Magistrate upon his throne, and fix the Crown upon his head, but we shall place within his hand the sceptre and legitimate power of the King, in despite of those 157 Borough-mongers, who have TRAITEROUSLY

usurped all but the pageantry and outward shew and forms of Royalty.

What is the condition of the King under this Faction? Instead of taking advantage of the elevation of his situation, where the Constitution had placed him, as the eye of the nation, for the purpose of taking extensive views for the advantage of the national interests, beyond the contracted horizon of ordinary men, his whole time is employed, his whole skill directed, not towards the duties of his high office, but in trying to keep his balance, in endeavouring to conciliate the support of such and such a Borough-monger, in order to obtain his permission to allow the Government to go on.—In truth, the Borough Faction have such power, that he is more like a Rope Dancer, than a King; as they make it necessary for him to be perpetually upon the alert to balance himself on his slippery elevation, whilst the utmost he can do is to keep his place. Such is the state to which he is reduced under the influence of this ignominious system, instead of having his throne fixed on the rock of the Constitution, and bound to the hearts of a whole people. This is not the situation in which the Laws and Constitution have placed the King, nor that which his dignity requires, and the best interests of the people, demand.

The System, of which I have now given but a short sketch, which was introduced at the Revolution, and grew out of the encroachments on the Prerogative of the King, aided by the innovations of time, has already cost this nation nearly Eight Hundred Millions of Debt; for though it has been wittily said, that one half of this enormous Debt has been incurred in resisting the perfidy and restless ambition of the house of Bourbon, the other half in striving to replace it on the throne of France, this is not true; the fact is, the whole has been incurred in the prosecution of the scheme of corrupting this House.

This question is so completely decided by Magna Charta, “which,” as Lord Coke says, “is such a fellow that he will ‘bear no equal,’ so strongly fortified by all our constitutional laws, that no inferior authority can be required; but, were I so disposed, I could cite a host of legal and constitutional Writers; and all those members of this house, who have from time to time expressed their sentiments in support of this measure, whose arguments were never confuted, and whose talents, though successful on all other occasions, were un-

availing when exerted in support of Reform. This problem, however, is easily solved, when we consider that the appeal is made to the Borough-mongers themselves, whose interest is opposite to the measure. Their interest is different from that of the people.

Having taken the Laws and the Constitution for my guide; in preparing the measure I shall have to propose, I at the same time examined attentively all those Plans for carrying the same principle into execution, which have at different times been proposed; and having avoided all those intricacies, which I considered as so many impediments in the way, have reduced it to that plain and simple form, the express image of the Constitution itself.—My Plan consists in a very few, and very simple, regulations; and as the Disease we now labour under has been caused by the disunion of Property and Political Right, which reason, and the Constitution, say should never be separated, the Remedy I shall propose will consist in re-uniting them again.

For this purpose I shall propose:—

That Freeholders, Householders, and others, subject to direct Taxation in support of the Poor, the Church, and the State, be required to elect Members to serve in Parliament.

That each County be subdivided according to its taxed male Population, and each subdivision required to elect one Representative.

That the Votes be taken in each Parish by the Parish Officers; and all the Elections finished in one and the same day.

That the Parish Officers make the Returns to the Sheriff's Court to be held for that purpose at stated periods.

And, That Parliaments be brought back to a Constitutional Duration.

The simplicity of this Plan appears from its being the true Constitution of England, which has already prepared all the means ready to our hands of carrying it into immediate effect; and I make no hesitation in delivering it as my well-digested opinion, that under the operation of this Reform, it would be attended with much less difficulty to return a whole Parliament, than to settle a dispute at a vestry about a parish pauper. By the adoption of this Plan of Reform, those disgraceful practices, which now attend even County Elections, would be put a stop to. No bribery, perjury, drunkenness, nor

riot; no "Wealthy Brewer," as was humorously described, who, disappointed of a job, takes, in consequence, "the independent line, and bawls out against "Corruption;" no opportunity would remain for such mock Patriotism: — no leading Attorneys galloping about the country, lying, cheating, and stirring up the worst passions amongst the worst people:—no ill blood engendered between friends and relations—setting families at variance, and making each county a perpetual depository of election feuds and quarrels:—No Demagoguing.—If I am a Demagogue, I am as complete a *flop de se* as can well be imagined—this puts an end to the occupation:—There would be an end to all odious and fanciful distinctions of persons and property—all would be simple and uniform; their weight and influence proportioned to their *intrinsic* value—no qualifications nor disqualifications—no invidious exclusions by reason of any office, from the highest to the lowest, either in the Elector or the Elected—no variable, fantastical, litigious rights of voting—no possibility of false votes—no treating—no carrying out voters—no charges of any kind,—no expense, legal or illegal—no contested elections.—The people would have a choice without a contest, instead of a contest without a choice;—no sham remedies worse than the disease pretended to be cured—No Grenville Act; here I speak feelingly; I have undergone this *remedy*:—It is the remedy of a toad under a harrow.—“*Haud ignara malis, miseric succure disco.*” That Act, which has been so highly extolled, was itself called a *reform*;—as all the acts aggravating the mischief, which have been substituted for the Constitution, are called in this House.

Under the operation of that Act, I have suffered a greater pecuniary penalty than any which the law would have inflicted for any crime I could have committed; this *remedy* is a luxury, a man must be very rich, indeed, to indulge himself in. I could not afford it a second time, and preferred abandoning my seat after having been returned, to undergoing another operation of the Grenville Act. One great object I have in view is to relieve other Gentlemen from the like benefits, by preventing the necessity of having recourse to such *remedies* in future—by getting rid of all disputes, and contested elections: this good consequence will result from the adoption of this Plan, besides preventing endless litigation, ruinous expense, per-

jury, ill blood, and periodical uproar and confusion, this House will be saved one-third of its time in Election Committees; and the Statute Book will be relieved from the shameful burden of one hundred and thirteen confused and intricate laws, all pitiful substitutes for the Constitution.

There may be some Gentlemen who think we should not get a better assembly within this House by this or any other Plan of Reform.—Even supposing, but by no means admitting, such should unaccountably be the case, the positive evils we should get rid of are sufficient recommendations to its adoption. It must also give rise to other important results—those who complain of popular clamour—of persons allying themselves with the people against the sentiments and decisions of this House, would cease to have any room for complaint. In the event of such a Reform no such clamour could exist, no such alliance could be formed; for then the sense of the people would be truly and fairly collected within these walls.

The benefits that would immediately follow the adoption of this Reform are incalculable. Though I am not one of those who would apply a sponge to the Debt of the Nation, yet am I firmly persuaded, that a reformed House of Commons would introduce such a system of economy, both in the collection and expenditure of the Public Revenue, as would give instant ease to the subject, and finally, and that at no very distant period, by a due application of national resources to national objects, *and to them alone*, free the people from that enormous load of debt and consequent taxation, under which the nation is weighed down.

Three descriptions of persons, I will admit, would have great cause to complain of this Reform: The Borough-mongers—the Lawyers—and the King's Printer. The whole of the question then is, Which is to be preferred, The interest of the whole Empire, or the interest of the Borough-mongers—the Lawyers—and the King's Printer?

At all events, I hope this consequence will follow, that after this night it will not be asserted nor insinuated, that I have any concealed purpose, that I shrink from speaking my sentiments frankly, that I decline to act an open part, or that I have any designs beyond those I avow: notwithstanding what I have urged, I beg leave to repeat, that I am open to conviction; that I am still ready to listen to all fair reasoning on the subject; that I have

nothing to bias my mind; nor any other view than the public good. It will, at the same time, be naturally understood, that having devoted so much of my time and reflection to this subject of vital importance, my opinions cannot easily be shaken, nor affected by slight and common-place arguments.

I have stated fully and dispassionately, and I hope clearly and satisfactorily, to this house and to the public, the Remedy for all our Grievances, which I have been so often called upon to produce. I have obeyed that call: in that at least I hope I have given satisfaction.—The Remedy I have proposed is simple, constitutional, practicable, and safe, calculated to give satisfaction to the People, to preserve the Rights of the Crown, and to restore the balance of the Constitution. These have been the objects of my pursuit—to these have I always directed my attention—*higher I do not aspire, lower I cannot descend.* I conjure this house to consider the necessity of doing something to satisfy the rational expectations of the public, that we should not go back to our respective parts of the country in our present acknowledged contaminated condition, without holding out some reasonable hope to the country for its peace and tranquillity, that a Reform adequate to the removal of the enormous and multiplied Abuses and Corruption now known to exist, and which I contend can only be effected by a House of Commons fairly chosen by the people, will early in the next session be entertained with good faith, and taken into our most serious consideration.—I would have the timid bear in mind who stand so much in dread of Innovation, that the simple Remedy now proposed is but a recurrence to those Laws and that Constitution, the departure from which has been the sole cause of that accumulation of evils which we now endure—that in many cases timidity is no less fatal than rashness—and “That the omission to do “what is necessary, seals a commission to “a blank of danger.”—I shall now conclude with moving, “That this House will, “early in the next session of parliament, “take into consideration the necessity of “a Reform in the Representation.”

On a Division, the Numbers were  
For Sir Francis Burdett's Motion - - - 15  
Against it - - - - - 74

Majority against the Motion - - - - - 59

## LIST OF THE MINORITY.

Adams, Charles	Maxwell, W.
Burdett, Sir Francis	Moore, Peter
Campbell, General	Thornton, Henry
Combe, Harvey	Tracey, Hanbury
Cuthbert, J. R.	Turton, Sir Thomas
Hutchinson, C.	Wardle, G. L.
Knapp, G.	Western, C. C.
Lefeuvre, C. S.	Wharton, John
Madocks, W. A.	

Lord Cochrane was, accidentally, out of the House at the time of the Division, and the hon. Mr. Lyttleton paired off.

\* \* \* In a few days the above Speech will be published, by Messrs Bone and Hone, Booksellers, Strand, in the form of a Pamphlet, for the purpose of general distribution.

## SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

MR. WARDLE'S PLEDGE.—This gentleman, the reader will recollect, pledged himself to show, that, by a House of Commons, chosen by the people, the amount of the Income Tax would be saved.—This he first stated at a Meeting at the Crown and Anchor; and, upon being reproached with it in St. Stephen's Chapel, he repeated his statement, in defiance of the threat of Mr. Tierney, who said, that, unless the statement was made good by Mr. Wardle, he would stand convicted in the face of the world. He does not appear to have said of what he would stand convicted; but, I suppose he meant of infamy, as in the case of the Duke of York.—Mr. Tierney and Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning and Mr. Perceval might think, that he really did stand convicted of infamy, in the case of the Duke; nay, Mr. Windham, who seems generously to volunteer as a forlorn hope upon all these occasions, did as good as say that this was the case, for that the taking away of Mrs. Clarke's letters was an act worse than the worst of those imputed to the Duke of York; and, as Mr. Wardle did take those letters away, in the manner supposed by Mr. Windham, he, of course, according to Mr. Windham's doctrine, was guilty of a crime greater than any that he alledged against the Duke, and, therefore, it was upon him that the infamy alighted.—This might be the opinion of Mr. Tierney and the Lords Petty and Castlereagh; of George Rose and Charles Long; of Mr. Huskisson and Mr. Ward and their two wives, who are pensioned upon us for life; of Mr. Canning and the Hunns; in short, it might be the opinion

of a very great part of the honourable House; but, it was not the opinion of the nation. The nation thought quite differently. The nation thought, and were convinced, that infamy, deep and everlasting infamy, and criminality deserving of legal punishment, (which punishment they hope yet to see inflicted) attached, not to Mr. Wardle, but to those who slandered him, and who used all the means in their power to do injury to his cause, which was justly regarded as the cause of the country.—Therefore the new threat of infamy, or, of "standing convicted," has not, I should suppose, much terror in it for Mr. Wardle.—The honourable House called upon him for proof of the truth of what he had said about the saving of the Income tax. His answer was, I will prove it, if you will give me the papers; if you will give me the accounts; but, without those papers, I will now, before the close of this Session, make a Statement which shall show, that I have good grounds for what I have said. The honourable House appears to have been eager to hear this statement. They did not, indeed, seem to be overjoyed in the same degree as when they hailed the "tangible shape;" but, they appeared to be very glad; "very glad indeed;" and Mr. Tierney was quite witty upon the subject.—Well, this Statement, this Chapter II. of the tangible shape, was laid before the honourable House on Monday last, the 19th inst.; and, really, the honourable House did not appear to express so much satisfaction as one might have expected, especially as it was pretty evident, that even more than Mr. Wardle had stated might be saved, without the smallest injury to the service of the country, or the smallest diminution of the splendour and dignity of the crown.—The Statement was very long, and embraced a great number of items of saving, some of which only I shall notice here, together with the answer of Mr. Huskisson, who, it seems, was the only person present thought capable of giving any answer at all. Here is another striking instance of the predominance of mind; for, this Mr. Huskisson, only about twelve or fourteen years ago, used to stand with his hat off, waiting for an answer to notes that he used to be sent with to Sir Evan Nepean. A little while before that his name cut a very respectable figure in the discussions of the famous Clubs at Paris, where he discovered great ability in urging the necessity of abolishing tythes and funds. Mr. Huskisson is certainly a clever man.

He has more head than all the rest put together; and, the only objection I have to him is, that he and his wife have *both fastened themselves upon us*, for their lives, to a very large amount, without my being able to discover any reason for it.—Mr. Huskisson was the person to answer Mr. Wardle; and, the selection was prudent, not only because he has more understanding as to such matters, than all the rest, but, because, by putting him forward, the rest were sure not to expose themselves.—

Mr. Huskisson began by complaining, that the general statement of Mr. Wardle had not been made in the honourable House, instead of the place where it was made; because, said he, *here* the details could have been canvassed, whereas, the consequence of making the statement "*out of doors*" (this is a very modest expression) must be to create in the public mind very improper impressions.—But, in the first place, had not Mr. Wardle as good a right to make his statement at the Crown and Anchor, as Mr. Canning had to make his statement at the London Tavern? Or, were those persons, to whom Mr. Wardle spoke, less capable of judging upon matters of *domestic economy*, than the crew of howling blood-suckers, by whom Mr. Canning was surrounded, and who fatten upon the miseries of war, were of judging upon matters of *foreign policy*? Or, is it to be pretended, at last, that none but the servants of the king have a right to address the people, and to communicate to them facts or opinions connected with politics?—Besides, Mr. Wardle had had the honour of making statements to the honourable House before. He had seen a good deal there already. He had seen the result of the proceedings in the case of the Duke of York. He had witnessed the vote in the case of Castlereagh and Reding, and also in the case of the three members and Mr. Quintin Dick, not forgetting the Irish revenue case. And, after all this, surely he might be excused for making a statement "*out of doors*." In doors people seemed to have become impatient; they seemed to have grown tired of statements; they pretty clearly evinced this on the morning of the ever-memorable 12th of May, when they voted 310 to 85 against Mr. Madocks's motion for Inquiry, and when there passed what will never be forgotten by those who were witnesses of it.—Again, Mr. Wardle had been told, by the ministers, that he was not entitled to any thanks for what he had done in the case

of the Duke of York. The *people* had thanked him; and, therefore, was it not natural that he should address himself to the people?—Mr. Huskisson also complained, that Mr. Wardle had made his statement *so late in the session*; and, it is well worth remarking, that he was *very* loudly censured for bringing forward his statement about the Duke of York so *early in the session*.—Nothing will please them. They themselves, indeed, find all times fit for their demands of money; for the loan-bills and tax-bills, and all sorts of bills tending to draw money from the people; but, if it be to inquire into how money can be saved, how public-robery can be checked; then the time must be considered; there must be due notice, and plenty of time given for *preparing a defence*.—It is not my intention to enter here upon a regular series of observations on the several parts of Mr. Huskisson's speech; but, there are two or three points, which I cannot pass over.—There was one general argument of Mr. Huskisson, namely, that as long as the establishments, offices, pensions, and expences, which Mr. Wardle represented as unnecessary, should be thought necessary by Parliament, there could no saving take place in any of the said departments of expence; and that, if parliament should think them unnecessary, then they would not want Mr. Wardle to tell them that a great saving might be made. This is very true; but, we did not want Mr. Huskisson to tell us this: we did not want an orator or philosopher from Paris to tell us one word of it. But, Mr. Huskisson appears not to have been aware of this material point: to wit; that it was not the *opinion of Parliament*, as at present constituted, that Mr. Wardle considered as the thing to be decided by; his position being, that such and such savings would take place under the controul of a parliament, chosen in a manner *different from the parliament now in existence*. In two words, the very groundwork of his proposition is, that many of the heavy expences, which the present parliament think necessary, are not necessary; and, in answer to a statement so grounded, Mr. Huskisson amuses us with saying, that as long as the parliament shall think the expenditure necessary, the proposed saving cannot be made.—Mr. Wardle may, for instance, and doubtless will, when he comes to his detail, say, "strike off this great pension to Mrs. Emily Huskisson; and this to Mrs. Rosalie (or some such name) Ward." And, will his

being told that the parliament thinks these pensions necessary be regarded as an answer to him? When he shall, as he doubtless will, call for the abolition of the pension of 500*l.* a year to *Mary and Maria HUNN*, the half-sisters, I believe, of Mr. Cannings, is he to be told, that this saving cannot be made, because the parliament thinks it right not to make it? He may; but this is the very thing he is about to bring before the public. He says, he is about to shew, that there are Eleven Millions a year that might be saved, and which the present parliament do not think it right to save. This is the very thing. It is, therefore, a downright absurdity to attempt to shut his mouth by saying, that such and such savings cannot be made, while the parliament chooses to continue the expences. Give us a parliament, says he, freely chosen by the people, and in which there shall be no trafficking in Seats, and then, I engage, that eleven millions of taxes will be saved; and here are the items upon which they would make the saving. Oh, no! say his opponents, the parliament could not make any such saving, as long as the parliament should think the present expences necessary. Why, this is downright nonsense. It is as naked a *parler-pour-parler* as ever was heard in the world.—This, however, was the general answer. Mr. Wardle represented the *German troops* unnecessary, and said the expence of them might be saved; but he was answered by being told, that the parliament thought them necessary. Upon the subject of the *Cavalry*, however, Mr. Huskisson attempted to give, and did really give, something of a reason. He said, they were useful as composing part of the POLICE. This was being very frank, indeed. It, in part, at least, answers a question that I have so often put: “what is all this monstrous standing army for?” Here is one of the purposes, at any rate. I hope, we shall bear this declaration in mind; that, we are to consider the cavalry as useful in the way of *police!* Very good: only, let us be sure not to forget it.—Mr. Wardle stated the expence of collecting the taxes at 2,800,000*l.* which Mr. Huskisson said was correct; but, Mr. Wardle overlooked the expence of the military and naval force kept up for the purpose of securing this collection, together with the great sums received by several persons, connected with the tax-gathering, and not paid at the several tax-offices, but whose salaries or allowances fall under other heads. I should like to know, what is paid annually, out of the taxes, for law,

I should not wonder if the revenue alone maintained three hundred lawyers of all sorts and sizes. No wonder that the bar is dumb, when the rights of the people are to be asserted.—Mr. Huskisson concluded with a very moving piece of eloquence. “He contrasted the *mild* and *impartial* mode, in which the public taxes were “collected here, with the *violent* manner, “in which they were levied in France, “where they were exacted by the *bayonet*, “and where, if an *unfortunate* man was in “arrear, soldiers were placed in his house, “living at free quarter until the amount “was paid.”—This is the only interesting part of Mr. Huskisson’s speech, except what related to the *cavalry* and the *police*.—I should, first, be inclined to doubt the fact about the mode of enforcing payment of taxes in France, had it not been stated by a member of the honourable House. Indeed, had it not been stated upon such authority, I should have set it down for a pure invention; for one of those worthy old Anti-jacobin devices, by the means of which the people of this country were, by John Bowles and his associates, so long affrighted and kept in subjection. But, after all, what is there in this contrast between the *English* and the *French* mode of collecting taxes? I do not wish to palliate the tyranny of the Emperor Napoleon; but, since Mr. Huskisson has thought proper to answer Mr. Wardle by reminding him of the manner in which taxes are collected in France; since we are, by means like these, to be scared from our desire to see eleven millions saved, though it is not easy to perceive how any man in his senses is to be scared by such means; since we are to have this sort of answer, let us, taking Mr. Huskisson’s facts for granted; aye, let us even go so far as to take his facts for granted about the collection of the revenue in France, and see what there is of solid distinction in the contrast which he attempted to draw.—A man in France, who is so *unfortunate* as to fall in arrear in the payment of his taxes, has soldiers placed in his house to live at free-quarter, till he does pay them. Oh, then, he can pay them, and therefore has it in his power to prevent the soldiers coming into his house? No, perhaps not. Well, then, the soldiers stay in his house, till they have eaten and drunk all that is eatable or drinkable in the house.—This is bad enough; and now let us see how they are collected in *England*. As long as the Englishman pays without any resistance or refusal, there is to be sure, no

violence; and this, I take it, is the case in France. I not only take it to be so, but I know that it must be so; and really, I am far from thinking the worse of the people of France for their rendering a violent manner necessary in the collecting of taxes imposed without their consent. It shews, that the people of France have courage in civil as well as in military matters, and that they are not to be so easily cheated by Buonaparté's sham Legislative Body, called together by his sham elections. If this picture be real; if we have not to ascribe it, in some degree, to a sneaking kindness which Mr. Huskisson still retains for his old friends, the good patriots of France, who disliked funds and tythes, and to his virtuous abhorrence of despotism: if the picture be real, Mr. Huskisson has told me the best news that I have heard for some time. I was afraid, that the people of France, amused by the name of elections, were content under the robberies, which (as we have been told) were daily committed upon them in virtue of *edicts*, or *decrees* or *senatus-consultums*, or other abominable acts, of no matter what name, issued by an assembly, who have no power or voice any more than so many barber's blocks, who come and go, who speak and hold their tongues, who say OUI and NON just as they are commanded by the Emperor's official Orator, from whom, in one shape or another, the wretches receive their dirty hire, though, at the same time, they swagger about and would fain pass for gentlemen, and talk of their honour and dignity in a strain that ought, one would think, to purchase them a kicking at every corner of the streets of Paris. I really was afraid, that the people of France had so long and so patiently listened to the gabble and bombast of these fellows about *la loi* and *la constitution*, that they had, at last, become completely duped; or had been so cowed down by the great number of soldiers in that military government, that they had lost all sense of injury, and all desire of obtaining justice. But, if Mr. Huskisson be correctly informed, and, I dare say he is, the people of France act in a way that compels their tyrants to have recourse to "violent means," in order to wring their earnings from them. This is a good hearing; because where violence is resorted to in order to collect taxes, there must be resistance, or, at least, refusal, on the part of those of whom the said taxes are demanded.—Begging the reader's pardon for this digression, I now return to the English mode of enforcing

the payment of taxes, and which mode Mr. Huskisson contrasted with the *bayonet* and *free-quarter* mode adopted in France. As long as we pay, *without resistance* and *without refusal*, we are, as I said before, quite secure against violence of any sort; but so, I take it for granted, they are in France; for, even highwaymen and house-breakers would invariably content themselves with taking from their subjects their goods and money, were it not, that, now and then, a murder is necessary to their own safety, which is not the case with tax-collectors, either in France or any where else. Well, then, in what does this "*contrast*" consist? What is there of *solid distinction* in it? Why, in France, if a man is, *unfortunately*, in *arrear*, that is to say, if he do not pay the taxes demanded of him, then, in that case, soldiers are sent to live upon him at free-quarter. Now, either he can pay, or he cannot. If the former, he has the power of keeping away the soldiers, and is not the *unfortunate man*, that Mr. Huskisson, in his humanity, seems to suppose. If the latter, that is to say, if he be *unable* to pay, is it not rather odd, that his house should be selected for *free quarter*, which always implies tolerable *good cheer*. It really is; you must excuse me, Mr. Huskisson; but I must say, that it is an odd thing, that a man who has the means of paying his taxes should unfortunately fall in arrear; or, that a man who has not the means of paying them, should be able to keep soldiers at free-quarter.—But, to return once more to the English mode of enforcing the payment of taxes, what is done, if a man refuse to pay? No matter upon what ground, whether upon *disinclination* or *disability*. It is all the same; and what is done? The *bayonet* is not sent. No, that it is not, unless you were to attempt to repel force by force, and were successfully to resist the sheriff's officers. Well; but how do we go on? Why, after a demand of the tax, a seizure is made upon the goods, buildings, lands, and in some cases, upon the body, of the man who cannot, or who does not, pay. In short, all his property is taken away from him, and he is, at last, left to begin the world a-new in rags. Now, Mr. Huskisson, what could the *bayonet* do more than this? Will you be so good as to tell me what it could do more? But, you will say, perhaps, that the bayonet is not used, at any rate; and that the bayonet is a ghastly looking thing. Very true; but, again I tell you, that, it is not used, because there is *no resistance*; that is

to say, because there is *no occasion for the bayonet*; that is to say, because those who *unfortunately fall in arrear*, can have all their property taken from them, and can be completely ruined, without the assistance of the bayonet.—Now, mind, *I do not find fault with this.* I know that there must be, *somewhere*, a force, at last, to compel some men to pay taxes; but, what I have said, will, I think, tend to make you a little cautious how you amuse yourself with drawing contrasts between the people of France and those of England upon the score of taxation. What you have said, admitting it to be true, about the use of violent means for the purpose of collecting the taxes in France, is really a great compliment to the people, and no small one to the government. The means would not be used, if the taxes could be collected without them; and the government not being able to collect taxes without the use of violent means, shows, and clearly proves, that the people of France are not so cowed down, are not such submissive creatures, are not such abject slaves, are not such degraded wretches, as quietly to give up their property piece-meal to a set of cowardly cheaters, who, surrounded with their Mamelukes, or other foreign mercenaries, would insult and rob the people “*au nom de la loi;*” dividing the plunder amongst themselves and their hungry relations.—Mr. Huskisson has seduced me into a digression, which has left me no time for any further remarks at present. This is, however, a subject to which I shall return again and again. As soon as I obtain a *full and correct* report of Mr. Wardle’s Speech, I will publish it in the same way that I have the Speeches of the Speaker and of sir Francis Burdett.

---

**ESSEX MEETING.**—Two articles signed by many respectable gentlemen of Essex, (which shall be given in my next) will shew what means have been used in that county to stifle the public voice.—I can, at present, only call the reader’s attention to them. I shall not fail to give an account of the Meeting, when it has taken place.

Botley, 22 June, 1809.

N. B. The debts of Miss TAYLOR have all been *paid*, and likewise those of her mother, or, at least, these latter have been settled, I believe, to the satisfaction of the creditors.—A *list* of the Subscribers is now preparing, and, in a fortnight, I hope to be able to lay before the public a statement of the whole business.—It is total-

ly false, that any *quarrel* has taken place between Miss Taylor and any of the persons who have had the management of the Subscription.

☞ THE PUBLIC ROBBERS, by which phrase I do not, of course, mean the ministers and their underlings, as some of the news-paper people seem to imagine, but those who have really robbed the public in withholding 22 documents out of 27; these public robbers deny most positively, that I was the author of the little pamphlet, which the Addington ministry sent to all the Churches in the kingdom, and which, I am told, MR. POULTER, like his neighbouring parsons, read instead of a *sermon*; the robbers deny that I was the author of that pamphlet; but, what will not those say, who after getting documents out of the War-office, could suppress 22 of them out of 27?—The next time I meet Mr. Poulter at Winchester, however, I will show him, and the other Winchester parsons, some documents that they will little expect to see; and, I think I can lay my hand upon the original of the *Circular Letter to the Ministers of the Parishes*, which was written by me, and in which there was a phrase or two interlined in the handwriting of Mr. Addington. The next time I meet Mr. Poulter at Winchester, I will put him and some of his brethren in mind of an anecdote or two, which they appear to have forgotten, but which I have not forgotten.

---

#### SPANISH SHEEP.

Several noblemen and gentlemen have written to me, upon the subject of *Sheep*, which they have, it appears, been informed, are coming from Spain, and are to be placed under *my care*; and, as it may possibly be of public interest and utility, I shall here state what will, I hope, be considered as a sufficient answer to all those who have honoured me with applications upon the subject.—I am not *certain*, that any sheep will be sent to my care; but, I have good reason to suppose, that *several thousands* of the very finest sheep in Spain will be sent to England, and that I, without any *property* in them whatever, but out of friendship for the owner, shall have, in a great degree, the care and management of them, unless he himself should arrive in England time enough to take the care upon himself.—If the flock, or any part of it, should be *sold* under my direction and controul, the sale will certainly

be by auction; and, I beg leave to observe, by way of saving the trouble of applications for preferences, that no part of the property will be mine, and that, of course, I shall not be able, unless the owner be arrived, to give the smallest preference to any one.—When the sheep arrive (if they do arrive), it is my intention to give due notice thereof, to every part of the kingdom; that is to say, if intended for sale. If the number should be small, I shall keep them in the neighbourhood of Botley; but, if it amount to some thousands, and if a sale were to be made, the place of sale would, I imagine, be somewhere near Winchester.—It is expected that the sheep will be landed at Portsmouth; and, a letter, which I have received from Sir JOHN SINCLAIR, as President of the Board of Agriculture, informs me, that, in consequence of an application from him, the Treasury has given orders to the Commissioners of Customs, at the Out-ports, and also to the Transport Board, to afford every facility to the safe and quick landing of the sheep. The season of the year is rather unfavourable. The heat, and the scarcity of water, on board of ship, will, I am afraid, prove fatal to a part, at least, of the flock; but, at any rate, it is of great importance, that there should be no delay in the landing; and, to prevent this, the Treasury appears to have taken the necessary precaution. I have provided as much, and, perhaps, more, pasture, than will be necessary; but, it is possible, that I may not have provided half enough. I therefore take this opportunity of requesting any gentlemen, who may be able to accommodate me with good wholesome pasture, for a month or two, to be so good as to write to me upon the subject. And also to let me know, if they can lend me shepherds for a little while, in case I should be at a loss for such assistance. It is a public concern; and, I trust, the friends of agriculture, in the neighbouring counties as well as in this, will gladly afford me all the aid in their power. Any where between SOERTON across to WINCHESTER, and on towards Stockbridge or Sutton; in short, any where within twenty miles of Botley, where there is good and wholesome sheep feed, may do for the purpose.—I should, of course, divide the flock, if numerous, in order to apportion the number of mouths to the quantity of food.—I take this opportunity of apologizing to those gentlemen,

who have written to me upon this subject, and whom I have not answered. It is quite impossible for me to answer all, or even half; and, therefore, I trust, that my silence will not, by any one, be attributed to any want of respect for him, or of disposition to give his letter an immediate answer.

W<sup>M</sup>. COBBETT.

#### OFFICIAL PAPERS.

FRENCH ARMY IN AUSTRIA.—*Twelfth Bulletin; Battle of Urfar.* (*Continued from p. 960.*)

At the same moment the marshal-prince of Ponte Corvo came to Lintz with the cavalry and the first brigade of Saxon infantry, gen. Vandamme, at the head of the Wirtemberg troops, and four squadrons of Saxon hussars and dragoons, repulsed the two first columns of the enemy, drove them from their position, took from them six pieces of artillery, made 400 prisoners, and threw them into confusion. The third column of the enemy appeared on the heights of Berslingbergh at seven in the evening, and his infantry in a moment took possession of the neighbouring mountains.—The Saxon infantry fell on the enemy with fury, drove him from his position, and took 300 prisoners, and several ammunition waggons.—The enemy has retired in confusion to Freystadt and Haslach. The bussars sent out in pursuit brought in 500 horse, and muskets, and a number of waggons and caissons were found in the woods. The loss of the enemy amounts to 2,000 in killed and wounded, besides prisoners. Our whole loss in killed, wounded, and prisoners, is not 400.

#### COBBETT'S COMPLETE COLLECTION OF State Trials:

To be completed in Thirty-Six Monthly Parts, forming Twelve large Volumes in Royal Octavo.

The SEVENTH PART of the above Work (being the first Part of Vol. III.) will be published on Saturday the 1st of July. One Part will appear, with the greatest regularity, on the first of each succeeding Month.

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 26.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 1, 1809.

[Price 1s.

"THE Mutiny amongst the LOCAL MILITIA which broke out at Ely, was *fortunately* suppressed on Wednesday, by the arrival of four squadrons of the GERMAN LEGION CAVALRY from Bury, under the command of General Auckland. Five of the ring-leaders were tried by a Court Martial, and sentenced to receive 500 lashes each, part of which punishment they received on Wednesday, and a part was remitted. A stoppage for their knapsacks was the ground of complaint that excited this mutinous spirit, which occasioned the men to surround their officers, and demand what they deemed their arrears. The first division of the German Legion halted yesterday at Newmarket on their return to Bury."—COURIER (ministerial) News-paper, Saturday 24th of June, 1809.

993]

[994

## SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

LOCAL MILITIA and GERMAN LEGION.—See the Motto, English reader! See the Motto, and then do pray recollect all that has been said about the way, in which Buonaparté raises his soldiers.—Well done, Lord Castlereagh! This is just what it was thought your plan would produce. Well said, Mr. Huskisson! It really was not without reason that you dwelt, with so much earnestness, upon the great utility of the *foreign* troops, whom Mr. Wardle appeared to think of no utility at all. Poor gentleman! he little imagined how a great genius might find useful employment for such troops. He little imagined, that they might be made the means of compelling Englishmen to submit to that sort of *discipline*, which is so conducive to the producing in them a disposition to defend the country, at the risk of their lives. Let Mr. Wardle look at my motto, and then say whether the German soldiers are of *no use*.—*Five hundred lashes each!* Aye, that is right! Flog them; flog them; flog them! They deserve it; and a great deal more. They deserve a flogging at every meal-time. "Lash them daily, lash them duly." What, shall the rascals dare to *mutiny*, and that, too, when the German Legion is so near at hand! Lash them, lash them, lash them! They deserve it. O, yes; they merit a double-tailed cat. Base dogs! What, mutiny for the sake of the *price of a knapsack!* Lash them! flog them! Base rascals! Mutiny for the price of a goat's skin; and, then, upon the appearance of the *German Soldiers*, they take a flogging as quietly as so many trunks of trees!—I do not know what sort of a place Ely is; but I really should like to know how the inhabitants looked one another in the face, while this scene was exhibiting in their town. I should like to have been able to see their

faces, and to hear their observations to each other, at the time.—This occurrence at home will, one would hope, teach the *loyal* a little caution in speaking of the means, which Napoleon employs (or, rather, which they say he employs), in order to get together and to discipline his Conscripts. There is scarcely any one of these loyal persons, who has not, at various times, cited the *hand-cuffings*, and other means of *force*, said to be used in drawing out the young men of France; there is scarcely one of the *loyal*, who has not cited these means as a proof, a complete proof, that the people of France hate Napoleon and his government, assist with reluctance in his wars, and would *fain see another revolution*. I hope, I say, that the *loyal* will, hereafter, be more cautious in drawing such conclusions, now that they see, that our "*gallant defenders*" not only require physical restraint, in certain cases, but even a little blood drawn from their backs, and that, too, with the aid and assistance of *German* troops. Yes; I hope the *loyal* will be a little more upon their guard in drawing conclusions against Napoleon's popularity. At any rate, every time they do, in future, burst out in execrations against the French for suffering themselves to be "*chained together and forced, at the point of the bayonet, to do military duty*," I shall just re-publish the passage, which I have taken for a motto to the present sheet.—I have heard of some other pretty little things of the sort; but, I rather choose to take my instance (and a very complete one it is) from a public print, notoriously under the sway of the ministry.

KING'S SPEECH.—On Wednesday, the 21st of June, the parliament was prorogued, with a Speech, delivered by Commission; on which Speech, after inserting it, I shall offer a few observations.—

"*MY LORDS, AND GENTLEMEN, We are commanded by his Majesty to acquaint*

" you, that his Majesty has great satisfaction in being enabled, by the state of " the public business, to release you from " your laborious attendance in Parliament. "—His Majesty doubts not that on your " return into your respective Counties, " you will carry with you a disposition " to inculcate, both by instruction and " example, a spirit of attachment to those " established laws and that happy Constitution " which it has ever been his Majesty's " anxious wish to support and to maintain, " and upon which, under Providence, de- " pend the welfare and prosperity of this " kingdom.—GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE " OF COMMONS, We have it in command " from his Majesty to thank you for the " liberal provision which you have made " for the services of the present year; " and to express the satisfaction which his " Majesty derives from your having been " enabled to provide for those services " without any great or immediate addition " to the burthens upon his People.—His " Majesty particularly commands us to " acknowledge your prompt attention to " his wishes, respecting an increased pro- " vision for the *poorer Clergy*; an object " in the highest degree interesting to his " Majesty's feelings, and deserving the " favourable consideration of Parliament. "—MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN, The " atrocious and unparalleled act of violence " and treachery by which the Ruler of " France attempted to surprize and to " enslave the Spanish nation, while it has " excited in Spain a determined and uncon- " querable resistance against the usurpation " and tyranny of the French government, " has, at the same time, awakened in other " nations of Europe a determination to " resist, by a new effort, the continued " and encroaching encroachments on their " safety and independence.—Although " the uncertainty of all human events, " and the vicissitudes attendant upon " war, forbid too confident an expecta- " tion of a satisfactory issue to the present " struggle against the common enemy of " Europe, his Majesty commands us to " congratulate you on the *splendid* and " *important success* which has recently " crowned the arms of the emperor of Aus- " tria, under the able and distinguished " conduct of his Imperial Highness the " Archduke Charles.—To the efforts of " Europe for its own deliverance, his Ma- " jesty has directed us to assure you, that " he is determined to continue his most " strenuous assistance and support, con-

" vinced that you will agree with him " in considering that every exertion for " the re-establishment of the independ- " ence and security of other nations, is " no less conducive to the true interests " than it is becoming the character and " honour of Great Britain."—The first observation that presents itself here is, that the king should have been advised to speak about the "public business" of the session, and to allude to particular parts of it, but to say not one word about that business, which had occupied above nine tenths of the time of the whole session, and compared to which, in point of importance, all the other business is a single sand compared to the sands composing a mountain. Why, the *business* of the past session consisted *solely* of the affairs of the Duke of York, Lord Castlereagh, Henry Wellesley, the Tinman's Prosecutor, and the Irish Excisemen. These, and the discussions arising out of them, made the *whole* of the business of the session. There was no other part of it that the nation paid the smallest attention to; that it either did care, or ought to care any thing about. And yet, as to *this business*, which has given rise to public meetings in every part of the kingdom, not one word is said in the Speech.—I like to see this, however, because it shews so clearly what it is desirable that the people should clearly see.—To make up for this omission, there is, however, a *whole paragraph* of the Speech devoted to the provision, which has, during this session, been made for the *poorer Clergy*, and which provision did, I verily believe, pass, because it was a matter which hardly any one thought worth his notice. The propriety of such provision, at any time, and especially at a time like this, appears to me to be, at best, very questionable. Let the list of *non-residents* be laid before the public; let the people see how few of those who enjoy the *wealth*, do the *duties*, of the Church, and then they will be able to judge of the justice of providing for the "*poorer clergy*" out of the earnings of the people. Let the benefices be properly distributed, and there will be no *poor clergy*; but, while one man has heaped upon him what ought to go to the providing for four or five of his brethren, is it any wonder, that there are some of the clergy poor? What would you think of a man, who should give the *whole* of his income to a part of his children and send the rest to the parish? You need not answer the question; but, you know that there is

a law for the compelling of such a man to keep these cast-off children. They are not to be thrown upon the parish while he has the means of supporting them. It would be scandalous if they were ; and what are we to think of a system, which gives two or three benefices to one man, while there are hundreds of the profession without any benefice at all?—But, besides the injustice of drawing upon the people in this way, let us mark a little the consequences. This provision is made for the professed purpose of assisting to support the poorer-clergy ; but, what will it do? Why, by making provision for them in *this way*, there will be the less necessity for giving them *a share in the benefices*; and, of course, there will be the more to be bestowed for *purposes* such as have been too much talked of lately to need a particular description in this place.—Well, then, here is a large sum of money granted, not, in fact, to add to the means of providing for the poorer clergy, but to the *patronage* of the ministry. In short, it appears to me to be a hundred thousand pounds (I believe that is the sum) given to those who have parliamentary influence. Suppose, for instance, there are *nine* livings in the whole, six rectories and three prebendaries, and that there are just as many clergymen as livings; but that the whole of the livings are given to *four* of them; and that one of them has *three*, as in the case of our Winchester Bishop's brother-in-law, MR. POULTER, who is rector of *four* parishes united into two livings, a prebend of Winchester, and Arch-Deacon, I believe, of the diocese. The consequence must be, that five out of the nine clergymen must go dig, or starve, or, at best, must perform for a starving salary, that duty for which the other three enjoy the income. Now mark, one has *three* livings, three have *two* livings each, and five have no living at all, and are either curates or beggars. Well, come, let us provide for these men; let us make provision for these “poorer clergy.” A sum is granted: provision is made; and what is the consequence? Why, when the three-flocked pastor dies, the ministry distribute his three livings amongst the three two-flocked pastors, or, if they have not interest enough, they are given to a youth of greater interest, who, as it were for the nonce, has had, agreeably to the declaration which is made at the ordination, *a call* to take upon him the cure of souls. Now, if this “provision,” as it is called, were not made, shame, perhaps,

might induce those, who have the distribution of livings, to give to three of the living-less five a living each; but, if they can obtain from the public purse the means of just satisfying the hunger of these five, they will, of course, bestow the vacant livings in twos and threes. Before, therefore, any sum of money should have been granted for this purpose, an inquiry ought to have been made into the *actual distribution* of the income of the church; for, unless that be taken into view, I see no end of such grants as that which has just been made. The more you grant, the more “poorer clergy” there will be of course. You do not get rid of the poorer clergy by the grants. It may render those comfortable, who are now poor, but you will immediately have new claimants, because, in the same degree as you remove the miseries of the poorer clergy by grants, the livings will be heaped upon the others, 'till, in a very short time, you will not see a single beneficed clergyman without a plurality of livings.—Why has the present time been chosen for the making of this grant? “The *rise in prices*.” But, what is that to the clergy? Their income rises with the rise of prices; and so it ought. What, then, is there to justify this application of so large a sum of the public money now? I can see nothing at all in the nature of the times to afford such justification. I can discover no argument that might not have been made use of a hundred years ago as well as at this time. In short, it appears to me to be a new scheme for augmenting the amount of the ministry's patronage; a scheme for augmenting the means of satisfying those political cormorants, commonly called borough-mongers, and by no means what the king appears to regard it, a source of relief to the “poorer clergy.”—There is, however, one good which will arise from this new mode of supporting clergymen; and that is, it will give those who pay taxes full authority to call upon the fat, the stall-fed priest, the double-pursed pluralist, for some shew of humility in political matters, at least, if none is to be expected from him in any of the other relationships of life. Let him remember, or, if he does not, we, I hope, shall, that the “poorer clergy” are his “brethren;” and, these his brethren, the lusty, the over-fed, the swoln, the rosy-gilled, the broad-faced and big-wigged gentleman leaves for us to keep. Let him be modest, then, when he appears before us, who have to maintain his

kindred. We have a right to expect a little less haughtiness and insolence on the part of the priesthood ; unless, indeed, which is not impossible, they look upon this grant from the parliament as an acknowledgment due to the part they have acted and figure they have cut in the recent transactions and enquiries. If a group of *printers or public writers* had been dragged to light, in the way that Dr. O'Meara, Dr. Locke, the Rev. Mr. Lloyd, the Rev. Mr. Beazeley, and that pink of all parsons the Crazy Parson, Williams, who, by-the-by, had "*cure of souls*" at the same time, were ; if a group of printers had been thus exposed, what would have been said of them ? Talk no more about the tricks and the various base arts of the methodistical or other sectarian priests ; for, my answer always will be, that I wait till I see amongst them a group like that above-named. I have heard of no censure of the church pronounced upon these men. Their brethren must, like other people's brethren, take to them, or cast them off ; but, my real belief is, that there are so many like them, or that would be like them if they could, that we never shall hear of their conduct being the subject of clerical censure. What is more, we have, in almost every part of the country, seen the clergy openly leagued with our political enemies, with those who have been distinctly accused of corruption. There has been scarcely a clergyman in all Hampshire, in particular, as far as my knowledge has reached, who has not done his utmost to give countenance to all that the people have been condemning. It was, it appears to me, a most indecent thing to advise the king, just at a time, when the sound of the names of the Reverend O'Meara, Beazeley, Williams, &c. &c. was still ringing in the ears of the members ; to advise the king, just at such a time, to recommend to the House of Commons a grant of money to the clergy, part of which money will possibly go to these very persons ; and, indeed, there is a fair *presumption*, that a part of it will go to Williams, the Crazy Parson with "*cure of souls*." If I were a member of parliament, I would call for an account of how this money had been disposed of. I would ascertain whose clutches it got into. I would see what sort of men the "*poorer clergy*" were. — The reliance which the king expresses, that the members of parliament will carry with them, into their respective *counties*, a disposition to inculcate a *spirit of attachment* to the *established laws and happy con-*

*stitution*, upon which, *under Providence*, depend the welfare and prosperity of the kingdom ; this reliance is matter worthy of particular attention. One does not, indeed, very well understand what is meant by a "*spirit of attachment*," nor is it very easy to discover for what the word *established* is put before *laws*, except we suppose it a compliment due from a cabinet of lawyers to the numerous hordes of the profession, to give the nation a specimen of tautology in every speech from the throne ; but, this we know, that there has been, in no part of the country, an attempt or the appearance of a disposition, amongst the *people*, to violate, or to disregard the "*established laws and happy constitution*," "*upon which, under Providence, depend the welfare and prosperity of this kingdom*." The members when they call us together, as, doubtless, they will, for the purposes of *inculcation*, need, however, be at no loss for topics. They have seen, and have gone through, a great deal during the last winter ; and, they will, of course, tell the people what has passed. Amongst other things they will remind them, than a Mr. WARBLE brought certain charges against the Duke of York ; that Mrs. Clarke and Miss Taylor, and others, gave such and such evidence ; that General Clavering and the crazy Parson Williams did so and so ; that Mr. Perceval and Mr. Adam had charged Dighy Hamilton to conjure Capt. Sandon not to destroy the Note ; that when they had been informed that the Note was destroyed, they brought the matter before the House ; that, "*under Providence*," the Note was preserved, and was examined by hand-writing decyphers ; that there was Dr. O'Meara, of the celestial unction, and the Rev. Mr. Beazeley, cherished by divine women ; that there was a man of the name of KENNEDY, who had corresponded about a Loan in exchange for a Piace ; that there were two Love-Letters of the Duke of York produced in the House of Commons ; that the House ACQUITTED the royal Duke ; that, since that acquittal, Mrs. Clarke has threatened to publish a Book, and that she has kept this book out of the press in consequence of having received very large sums of money. — The members will, doubtless, remind us, and endeavour to keep constantly alive in our recollection, that, at the time when the Charges were brought forward against the Duke of York, there was an out-cry, a monstrous halloo ; a war-whoop, set up about a *Jacobin Conspiracy*.

racy against the *House of Brunswick*; that it was asserted, with surprising noise of voice and emptiness of skull, that the conspirators meant to degrade the Army, the Church, and the Throne; that it finally appeared, that the said conspirators were no where to be found; that infamy was, according to Mr. Canning, to attach either to Mr. Wardle or to the Duke of York; that the nation, with voice unanimous, have thanked Mr. Wardle, and that the House of Commons acquitted the Duke of York.—The members will, doubtless, remind us, that, when Mr. Wardle first brought forward his Charges, an universal laugh was set up against him, when he talked of an open shop in the city for the Sale of Offices under Government, and that Mr. Perceval treated the story with derision; that, it afterwards appeared, that, at this very time, Mr. Perceval had been informed of the existence of such shop, but, as he said, his reason for disguising the fact was, he wished to entrap the office-sellers, that he had set people to work for that purpose, and that he had now succeeded and caught the delinquents in his trap.—The members will scarcely fail to remind us of the utter astonishment that became visible on the countenances of the East India Directors, when the fact slipped out, that there was now-and-then an office at their disposal, sold, contrary to law; that they called aloud for a Committee upstairs; that this Committee soon proved, that the traffic had long been as common as the dealings in Smithfield market; and that, amongst other transactions, offices under the East India Company had become objects of barter for *livings in the Church* and for *Seats in the House of Commons*.—Our “representatives” will, surely, remind us; the guardians of our purses; the protectors of our “happy constitution,” will certainly not fail to remind us, that Mr. Perceval, “under Providence,” narrowly missed catching one of his colleagues in his trap; for that it appeared from the Report of the up-stairs Committee, that Lord Castlereagh, while President of the Board of Controul, while filling an office intended to be a check upon the East India Directors, had offered an East India writership to be given in exchange for a Seat in the House of Commons, of which House also he was a member.—Yes, the honourable members will, surely, remind us of this, and further, that, when the matter was brought before the honourable House, and a motion was made for censuring the

said Lord Castlereagh, the honourable House did reject the said motion, upon the ground, that the *act was not completed*.—Our worthy representatives will, I dare say, next proceed to remind us, that, in a few days after this last occurrence, Mr. Madocks stated, to the honourable House, that he was ready to prove at their bar, that a Seat in that House had been sold to Mr. Quintin Dick, upon condition that he should vote as the ministers wished; that the sale was made by Mr. Henry Wellesley, a Secretary of the Treasury, and that Mr. Perceval, Chancellor of the Exchequer, was privy to the transaction; that Mr. Dick, rather than vote as the ministers wished in the case of the Duke of York, resigned his seat; and that, as this act was *complete*, he hoped that the House would set its face against it, when he had proved it by evidence at the bar.—Our faithful representatives will, surely, tell us, that the honourable House came to a division upon this subject, and that the honourable House resolved, by a majority of 310 against 85, that not even an Inquiry should take place.—When our worthy representatives have gone thus far, they will, perhaps, the better to illustrate and enforce their doctrines, go back to the year 1802, and remind us, that, in that year, this same Mr. PERCEVAL, being then Attorney General, prosecuted a Tinman of Plymouth, named PHILIP HAMLIN, for having offered to buy a place in the Custom-house; that Hamlin most solemnly declared his ignorance of his crime (having for years, seen places under government publicly advertised for sale), expressed the deepest sorrow, and humbly sued for mercy, seeing that a heavy punishment must be the ruin of himself and a large family; that, upon the affidavits being produced, Mr. Perceval still called for judgment upon this man, in the name of *Public Justice*; and, that the man, for only offering to purchase a place under government, at a time when such places were daily advertised for sale, in the public news-papers; that this man, for this offer, made under such circumstances, was, at the prosecution of this same Mr. Perceval, sentenced to pay *a fine of a hundred pounds to the king, and to be imprisoned for three months*.—Of all these things, and of Mr. Curwen's Bill, and other such matters, our honourable representatives will, at the suggestion of the king to come and instruct us, doubtless remind us; but, lest, by any accident, they should forget it, I

trust, that we shall not fail to remind *one another* of them : I trust, that every man, who has it in his power to communicate these valuable facts to those, who are not acquainted with them, will not think it labour lost to make such communication ; but bear in mind constantly, that every man informed as to these matters is a man enrolled in the war against Corruption and its accompanying Oppression.— Having expressed great *satisfaction* at the *small* addition which has this year been made to the *burdens* of the people, the Speech next looks abroad, and talks of the *atrocious* and *unparalleled* act of violence and treachery by which the ruler of France attempted to surprize and enslave the Spanish nation. As to the *atrociousness* of the act I heartily agree ; but, I never can allow it to be *unparalleled* ; for without going very *far* back into history, I could cite much stronger instances of both *violence* and *treachery* ; but, especially of the latter ; of the basest treachery ; the blackest perfidy ; the most cruel and sanguinary deeds ; and all with a view of finally committing *robbery* ; I mean robbery of the lowest stamp, such as the stealing of precious metals and stones. Why, neither of the kings of Spain has been thrown into a dungeon, kept awake 'till he has gone mad, or been smothered, or poisoned, or stabbed, and that, too, under the base and perfidious pretence of *taking care of his person*. No : the kings of Spain are both alive and well, though Napoleon has them as much in his power as I have the pigs in my sty. There has not been, that we have heard of, any miscreant (the other day a *commis* in some *bureau*, perhaps) to tease the kings of Spain with sham negotiations, and to offer them his insolent advice. Buonaparté, supposing *both* the kings of Spain to have been *betrayed* into his clutches, and to have been compelled to sign their respective acts of abdication, did, at any rate, take their kingdom from them *at once*, and *openly* : whereas the base wretches, to whose conduct I allude, proceeded in the most cowardly and underhand manner ; and, after having committed robbery and murder upon the property and persons of sovereigns full as lawful as those of Spain, not only set up for persons of singular humanity, but made the nation, who were base enough to submit to their command, pay for the promulgation of an endless series of falsehoods, intended to stifle the cries of the oppressed, and to humbug and defraud the world. With

these facts before us ; with these facts as well known as that the sun shines and that night brings darkness, I can never agree to apply the epithet "*unparalleled*" to Napoleon's conduct towards Spain.—Besides, in all these philippies against Napoleon, with regard to Spain, those of the *Spanish Nobles*, who have joined, and sworn allegiance to, his brother, seem to be left out of sight. *There is treachery indeed !* Napoleon has the plea of a conqueror ; but, these nobles have no plea at all, unless it be their conviction, that it will be for the good of their country to place Joseph Buonaparté upon the throne, and that is a plea of which we will not admit. We seem always to forget, that Joseph Napoleon is at Madrid, surrounded by Spanish *Grandees*, who have sworn allegiance to him. Our spite against the Buonapartés is so great, that we seem to forget the misconduct of every body else. All the mischiefs are ascribed to them. All the kings and princes, who *fight on their side*, are perfectly innocent ; they are objects of our *compassion* ; it is Buonaparté who seduces them ; they being of the Lord's anointed cannot commit sin, and all the sins, which, to the carnal eye, they appear to commit, are to be laid upon him, and to be answered for by him.— As to all that the Speech says about the *délivrance* of Europe, as it has been said in about fifteen king's speeches before this, it will not be expected, that I should offer any remark upon it. The "*splendid* and "*important* success, which has recently "crowned the arms of the Emperor of "Austria," cannot, however, pass without some little notice, but, why need we be surprised at this description, when we recollect the recent rejoicings for successes in Portugal? Those, who could fire the Park and Tower Guns and make illuminations upon hearing, that an English army had defeated a French *rear-guard*, would naturally advise the king to talk of the *splendid* and *important* *success* of Austria, which still leaves Buonaparté in possession of the Austrian Capital.—This is certainly a time, and things are now in a posture, for producing great events ; but, the worst of it is, there is *only one great actor*. There may be some truth in the accounts of *insurrections* in Germany and in the Tyrol ; but, it is by no means ascertained, that they are *in favour of Austria*. Between the two ; between France and those whom France aims at supplanting, the people appear to have got loose. The

kings and emperors have been fighting for the mastership over them, and the people seem to have become, during the battle, their own masters. If this were to go on, it would be a most glorious thing: this would be the real “*deliverance* of Europe;” but, this, I am afraid, is not what is meant in the Speech. I am afraid, that by “the “*deliverance* of Europe,” and by the “*re-establishment* of the *security* and *independence* of other nations;” by these, I am afraid, is meant, the *re-establishment* of the *old system all over Europe*; and, if that be the meaning, the object will assuredly never be accomplished.—The Expedition, which we are now sending out, and which is said to amount to 40,000 men, ought to do something in the way of Europe’s *deliverance*; but, if it go either to Germany or Spain, I do not see how it can do any thing at all in that way. Some say it is going to *Hanover*, and, if none but the *German Legion* were going, I should hail their departure; because I should like, of all things, to see those heroes engaged in the noble enterprize of rescuing their country from the hands of the French.—Forty thousand men is no trifling army for England to send forth; and, really, if it come back, without having performed any service, and even without having performed an *adequate* service, it will be high time for us to inquire whether the expence of this army cannot be saved.—If this Expedition should fail, and, if Napoleon should succeed in extinguishing Austria and in subduing Spain, it will then become us to consider, of what *avail* can be any further endeavours on our part, to stir up the continent against him. What good can we do ourselves; and what harm can we do him, by a perseverance in this restless system of purchasing insurrections; for, in truth, we excite nothing worthy of a much higher title? The philosophers, who are hired to write paragraphs, in the Courier and such prints, against Buonaparté, never appear to advert, even for a moment, to the circumstance, that, as far as the conquests of France have extended, there is a new set of *proprietors*, and that these are the most clever and active people in each state respectively. It is not a little matter that will overset these men; it is not a war, carried on by little lawyers, that will do it, notwithstanding all the sanguine expectations of the hirelings in London, and even of the Morning Chronicle, which seems to be, all at once, quite overpowered with the tide of joyful news

from the continent. They have got formidable *insurrections* against Napoleon, in every quarter and corner of Europe; where he has troops too numerous to leave room for insurrections, they have got *mutinies* amongst those troops; they have brought out a fresh Duke of Brunswick; they have pushed forward the king of Prussia; and, though they have not, as yet, absolutely got over the Emperor of Russia, the Morning Chronicle is very sanguine in the hope, “that the *amiable* queen has not wholly lost her influence over his heart, and “that she may succeed in recalling him “to the paths of *virtue* and *honour*.” That is to say, to induce him to employ his soap-eaters to cut the throats of our enemies. That is the plain English of the “paths of “*virtue* and *honour*.” What abominable hypocrisy men fall into, even without thinking of it, in this age of cant and affectation! How the Queen herself would laugh at this, if it were translated to her! “*Virtue* and *honour*,” indeed! She would laugh to the splitting of her sides—Lest, however, the *virtue-and-honour* expedition should fail, the Courier, by way of last resort, has an *insurrection* for the Emperor Alexander, our late “magnanimous ally.” This extends even to a threat of deposition, unless he immediately recall his soap-eaters from their march against our friends. All these *insurrections* are for us and our interests. “A rumour,” says the Courier of Wednesday last, “was in circulation “last night, that a messenger had arrived “with intelligence of an *insurrection* in “St. Petersburg. A number of the nobility and men of influence were said to “have *menaced* the Emperor with *deposition* “unless he consented to order the return of the “troops which were marching against Austria, “and also immediately negotiate a peace with “Great Britain. We know not whether “such intelligence was brought by a messenger, but rumours to the above effect “have been received from various quarters. “We shall be happy to find them well founded.”—Now, if the French government were, in their half-official papers, to make publications of this sort, how our hirelings would abuse them! How base it is, too, to express a hope of obtaining *peace* with a sovereign by the means of an *insurrection* against him amongst his people! Here is an explicit avowal, on the part of a news-paper, which is considered as speaking the sentiments of the government; an explicit avowal of an anxious wish, that *insurrection* may have taken place in Russia,

with threats to *dethrone* the Emperor, unless he withdraws his armies and negotiates an immediate peace with England. What would this hireling say, if a number of persons in England were found to engage in a plan to excite an insurrection for a similar purpose: to compel the king, for instance, to make peace with Buonaparté? What would the hireling say? Why, "away with the *traitors* to the gallows and the gibbet!" Those, who should be guilty of such a crime in England, would be "traitors." And, why are they not traitors in Russia? That is a "regular go-vernment" as well as this. Where is the difference, then? The fact is this; that we appear to have laid it down as a maxim, that nothing, in any creature, is criminal that tends to our advantage; or, rather, to the advantage of those, who live upon the taxes in England.—I am, however, most surprized at the Morning Chronicle, which seems to have enlisted under the banners of the most sanguine Deliverers, and which really seems to suppose, that to cut Buonaparté's throat would produce a restoration of the golden age. The Morning Chronicle is continually belabouring poor Buonaparté; and without rhyme or reason. I should like to have an opportunity of seriously asking the editor of that paper, whether he really believes; whether he can believe, that totally to *destroy* the power of Buonaparté would be an unequivocal good. I should like to put this question to him, and to receive his answer, in a frank manner. This editor must certainly see, that, if all the old governments of Europe were, all at once, again restored, they would not only restore all their abuses, but would create tens of thousands of new ones, and would take care so to bind down their subjects, so to load them with chains, as to relieve themselves from all future danger of revolution. In short, a system of slavery, such as never was before heard of, would be established from one end to the other of the continent. I should suppose, that, without tracing the consequences to England, here is quite enough to make any reflecting man doubt the wisdom of wishing for the total destruction of the power of Buonaparté. Besides, as he goes on, he does some good as well as mischief. He must sweep away many a gang of public-robbers; many a nest of harpies he tramples to death in his progress; many knots of petty tyrants he disperses, stripped of their ill-gotten authority, and leaves them to be cuffed about

by those, over whom they have tyran-nized; many a mob of vile wretches, who, instead of exercising the power of making laws, ought to be working at the galleys or in the mines; many a set of these most detestable of mankind, who inflict all the pains and penalties of despotism, under the names and forms of liberty and law.—I am satisfied, that, if the people of this country enjoy their rights, France never can invade us with success, how-ever powerful she may be. Being satisfied of this, I look upon Buonaparté's power with much less terror than most people do; and I can truly say, that, for some years past, his successes have given me no uneasiness. Knowing that he can-not beat us if we have our rights, I know, of course, that there is no danger to be apprehended from him, which danger it is not in our power to remove. With those, who think that the people ought not to have their rights, the case must be very different; but, an excellent general rule is, that, what is good for them is bad for us, and what is bad for them is good for us; and, I must confess, that, when I hear certain people express their sorrow at events upon the continent, I derive great consolation from reflecting, that what makes them sorry, must, somehow or other, contain that which ought to make me glad. I do not stop to ask how this is. I draw the consolatory conclusion at once, feeling it impossible that their inter-ests and mine should ever, in any case, be the same.—Seeing things in this way, I am not in such haste to wish for the total overthrow of the power of Buonaparté, which power, as I said before, is not at all dangerous to us, if we have our rights; for, in that case, it is quite im-possible for him to set his foot in England. We ought, therefore, to think well before we make any further effort to send troops upon the continent. At sea we ought to be very careful to preserve a decided su-periority; but, I really cannot see what we have to do with any part of the continent, the coasts of Spain and France ex-cepted.—On we shall go, however, in the old way; millions upon millions more will be expended upon continental projects; we shall be so much the weaker, and he, whose power we are so anxious to annihilate, will be so much the stronger. This is my opinion as to what will take place; and I shall be very glad to find myself deceived. The war, with our government, has long been a war of

*passion.* Reason and policy have no longer any thing to do with it. It is a war against Napoleon's *person*. So it really appears; for the moment there is a chance of getting at him, away we send men and money and ships and every thing that we can rake together.—This is fine sport for the contractors and jobbers; but, what say those who have their incomes from the funds, and which incomes must go regularly on diminishing? No matter; for, it is to their credulity in the first place, and their baseness in the next place, that we owe all the complicated evils under which we now labour.

**ESSEX MEETING.**—From the documents, relating to this Meeting, which will be found below, it will be seen, that the Sheriff took upon him to refuse to call a County-Meeting, because some persons sent him a requisition *not to call one*. The *impudence* of this surpasses every thing. It is very clear, that if this be permitted, there can be no County-Meeting, unless the minister of the day pleases, that there should be one; for, the minister has the chusing of the *Sheriff*, and the Sheriff can always get people to send him a paper, if he will ask for it, requesting him not to do what he wishes not to do. The “glorious Constitution” would come to be a fine thing at last. The people might have Meetings to petition the king; Oh, yes! certainly, meetings to petition the king, *just as often as the king's servants please*, but no offender; and, of course, they would please only when the evident intention of the people was to praise them, or their conduct. What a despicable farce! Really one cannot talk of it with patience. To confine oneself within common bounds of expression, is to wrong one's indignant feelings.—I am told, that Essex is a famous county for Political Parsons, who are also Justices of the Peace. Some of these, at the Cintra-Meeting, acted a most indecent part. A gentleman, who was present, told me, that they split and tore up a large mahogany dining table, and flew at their opponents, brandishing the legs and other parts of it. And yet there are those who wonder *why the Churches are empty!*—There has been a good deal of talk about “popular encroachment;” but, I do not believe, that, at any period of the history of England, the people were ever treated with such contempt as they have now been treated with in Essex. A County Meeting is the usual mode of assembling for the purpose of addressing or petitioning or

doing any thing as to which the sense of the county is to be taken; and, if the Sheriff, an officer appointed by the king, is to be the *Judge* whether, upon any occasion, a meeting is to be held, or not; why, then, of course, the people are never to meet in County Meeting *without the king's permission*. And this is “the *constitution*,” is it? This is that constitution, is it, for which we are to fight, and to spend our last shilling?—Upon this occasion, there is something peculiarly odious in the refusal of the Sheriff; because he makes use of the authority of the king *in opposition to Mr. Wardle*. Well, let him do it: we shall see who will lose by it in the end.

N. B. Mr. WARDLE'S Speech in my next, at full length if possible; and, when we have that before us, we shall, with the greater advantage, proceed with our discussion of the subject of Parliamentary Reform.

*Botley, Thursday, 29 June, 1809.*

#### PROCEEDINGS

*In COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &c. relative to the recent INQUIRY in the House of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK. (Continued from p. 915.)*

#### ESSEX MEETING.

To the Nobility, Clergy, Freeholders, and Inhabitants of the County of Essex:

We, the undersigned Freeholders and Inhabitants of the County of Essex, request you to assemble at the Shire-hall, at Chelmsford, on Tuesday next the 27th inst. at twelve o'clock, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of returning thanks to G. L. Wardle, esq. for his spirited and upright conduct in the House of Commons, and the members who supported him during the late Inquiry; and also of expressing your sentiments on the corrupt Practices and gross Abuses which have been brought to light by evidence given in that house during the late session of parliament.—We are compelled to make this direct application to you, in consequence of the refusal of the Sheriff, to whom two Requisitions have been presented, desiring him to use that authority to convene the County, which, by late practice, has devolved officially upon him, and the ministerial exercise of which has been rarely, if ever, before refused. The first Requisition he rejected on the ground of the subscribers not having designated themselves Freeholders, and on account of the Inhabitants being summoned as well

as Freeholders. Whether, maintaining as we still do the right of the Inhabitants, we can be justified or not in our concession to his opinion, we did concede those points, which his letter led us to imagine formed the only objections to our Requisition, and presented another in the manner he prescribed. This second Requisition however was, to our surprize, likewise refused, upon a ground totally different from those alleged in the first instance; namely, on account of an application conveyed to him from a great number of persons in various parts of the County, expressing an opinion that such Meeting was unnecessary and inexpedient. This application, it is to be observed; the Sheriff states to have received on or before the 31st ult., although in his answer, dated the 2d inst, he makes no mention of that circumstance as forming any ground for his refusal at that time. We shall abstain now from any comment upon these proceedings; but we most anxiously call upon you to maintain the Right of the People to meet and consider the conduct of their Representatives, to canvas public measures, and to prefer any petition, complaint, remonstrance, or other declaration or address to the King, or either House of Parliament. This is a fundamental right, which it is the duty of every man to assert and defend; and which would be practically destroyed if a judicial power founded on any authority or advice of individuals can be assumed by the Sheriff; and is allowed to prevent the assembling of the people for such purposes, and on such occasions. (Signed) Montagu Burgoyne, Mark Hall; S. Chamberlayne, Ryes; John Disney, The Hyde; J. B. Chamberlayne, Ryes; T. H. White, Sewells, Harlow; W. Lord, Gladwyns; Daniel W. Harvey, Feering House; W. Newman, Brentwood; W. Bliss, Brentwood; J. Barnard, Harlow; Ralph Polley, Bocking; J. Mumford, Harlow; G. W. Potter, Rochford; James Hobbs, Braintree; James Digby, Rochford; Robert King, Brentwood; Joseph Aldridge, Baddow; Joseph Joyner, High House; W. B. Jarrold, Manningtree; T. Chaplin, Harlow; David Taylor, Harlow; Frederic John Nash, Bishop Stortford; John Cochran, Plaistow; W. Cordell, London; Joseph Jackson, London; W. Hibbit, West Ham.

At a Meeting of the Freeholders and Inhabitants of the County of Essex, held at the Crown and Anchor, in the Strand,

the 8th of June, 1809, the following Resolution was adopted:—That, having learnt that a Requisition, signed by 100 respectable gentlemen and yeomen of the County, has been presented to the High-Sheriff, to convene a Meeting of the County for the purpose of returning Thanks to G. L. Wardle, esq. for his spirited and upright conduct in the House of Commons during the late Inquiry, and also to express their sentiments on the corrupt practices which have been brought to light by evidence given in that House; and having likewise heard that an application has been made to the Sheriff, with a view of preventing such Meeting from taking place, and that the High-Sheriff has declined to convene the County, upon the ground of the Requisition not purporting to be a Requisition of the Freeholders, and of the Subscribers to it not being designated themselves as such: We, the undersigned Freeholders and Inhabitants of the County, without giving any opinion upon the questions that may be submitted to a County Meeting, do declare our sentiments, that Meetings of the Freeholders and Inhabitants, to consider the conduct of their Representatives, and to discuss public measures on occasions that they deem sufficiently important, are highly expedient; that this is an inalienable right of the People, the exercise of which ought not to be impeded, and which cannot be taken away without an infringement of the Constitution which is the pride and boast of Britain, and the envy and admiration of the world. (Signed) T. Brand, H. St. John Mildmay, W. Honywood, W. Smith, S. Whitbread, C. C. Western, R. Baker, M. Burgoyne, P. Ducane, jun., T. Holt White, W. Martin, J. Reddin, J. Claridge, T. Wood, Daniel Ross, S. Chamberlayne, Peter Wright, Osgood Hanbury, John Luard, John Disney, J. B. Chamberlayne, T. W. Western, Charles Onley, Philip Salter, T. T. Cock, J. Griggs, R. M. Robinson, Jeffreys Salter, J. Godfrey, G. Wyatt, J. Joyner, D. W. Harvey, Wm. Newman, G. Prentice, J. Digby, J. Hobbs, Robert King, Jos. Aldridge, W. Lord, J. Barnard, Ralph Polley, W. B. Jarrold, J. Mumford, Thos. Marsh, John Richardson, T. Joslin, T. Wright, James Kavanah, John Grove, John Clarke, Wm. Bliss, John Offin, Abraham Offin, T. Finch, John Sturgeon, Wm. Overhead, Charles Marston, John Offin, jun., Rob. White, Wm. Offin, J. Jackson, T. Keye, James Keye.

## OFFICIAL PAPERS.

## FRENCH ARMY IN AUSTRIA.

*Thirteenth Bulletin, dated Ebersdorf, May 28.*

During the night of the 26th and 27th, our bridges on the Danube were carried away by the waters and the mills which have been set free. We had not time to finish the piles and fix the great iron chain. To day one of the bridges has been re-established, and we expect the other will be completed to morrow.—The Emperor spent yesterday on the left bank surveying the fortifications which are raising on the island of In-der-Lobau and in order to inspect some regiments of the duke de Rivoli's corps, stationed at this sort of tête-de-pont.—On the 27th, at night capt. Baillie, aid-de-camp of the Viceroy, brought the agreeable tidings of the arrival of the Army of Italy at Bruck. Gen. Lauriston had been sent in advance, and the junction took place on the Simeringberg. A chasseur of the 9th, who was proceeding as scout to a detachment of the Army of Italy, met a chasseur of a platoon of the 20th, sent by gen. Lauriston. After having observed each other for some time, they discovered that they were Frenchmen, and embraced. The chasseur of the 20th proceeded to Bruck to repair to the Viceroy, and the chasseur of the 9th repaired to gen. Lauriston, to inform him of the approach of the Army of Italy. During twelve days the two armies had received no intelligence of each other. On the evening of the 26th, gen. Lauriston was at Bruck, at the head-quarters of the Viceroy.—The Viceroy has displayed, during the whole campaign, a calmness and an extent of observation which are the presages of a great general.—In the relation of facts which have graced the Army of Italy during these last 20 days, his Majesty has marked with pleasure the destruction of the corps of Jellachich. It was this general whose insolent proclamation enkindled the fury and sharpened the daggers of the Tyrolese. Pursued by the duke of Dantzig—in danger of being flanked by the brigade of gen. Dupellin, whom the duke of Auerstadt had dispatched by way of Mariazell, he ran as into a snare upon the van of the Army of Italy.—The archduke John, who, so short a time since in the excess of his presumption, degraded himself by his letter to the duke of Ragusa, evacuated Gratz yester-

day, the 27th, taking with him hardly 25 or 30,000 men, of the fine army with which he entered Italy. Arrogance, insults, excitements to revolt, all his actions, which bear the stamp of rage, have turned to his shame.—The people of Italy have conducted themselves as the people of Alsace, Normandy, or Dauphine, would have done.—On the retreat of our soldiers, they accompanied them with their vows and their tears, and led individuals who had lost their way, by bye-paths, five days march to their army; and when any French or Italian prisoners were brought by the enemy into their towns or villages, the inhabitants brought them assistance, and during the nights endeavoured to disguise them and assist them in their flight.—The proclamations and the discourses of the archduke John inspired only contempt and scorn; and it would be difficult to describe the joy of the people of the Piave, the Taglamento, and of the Frioul, when they saw the army of the enemy flying in disorder, and the army of the sovereign and the country returning in triumph.—When the paper, were examined which belonged to the intendant of the Austrian army, who was at the head both of the government and the police; and which were taken at Padua, in four carriages, the proof of the love which the people of Italy bear to the Emperor was then discovered. Every body refused the places offered them; no one was willing to serve Austria; and among seven millions of men, who compose the population of the kingdom, the enemy could not find more than three wretches who did not repel seduction.—The regiments of Italy, who had distinguished themselves in Poland, and who had emulated in the campaign in Catalonia, the most ancient French campaigns, covered themselves with glory in every engagement. The people of Italy are marching with rapid strides to the last period of a happy change. That beautiful part of the Continent, to which are attached so many great and illustrious recollections, which the Court of Rome, that swarm of monks, and its own divisions, had ruined, is appearing with honour again on the theatre of Europe.—All the details which reach us of the Austrian army shew, that on the 21st and 22nd its loss was enormous. The choice troops of the army have perished. The good folks of Vienna say, that the manœuvres of gen. Danube saved the Austrian army.—The Tyrol and the Voralberg are com-

pletely subjected. Carniola, Styria, Carinthia, the territory of Salzburg, Upper and Lower Austria, are pacified and disarmed.—Trieste, that city where the French and Italians suffered so many insults, has been occupied. One circumstance in the capture of Trieste, has been most agreeable to the Emperor—the delivery of the Russian squadron. It had received orders to fit out for Ancona, but, detained by contrary winds, it remained in the power of the Austrians.—The junction of the army of Dalmatia will soon take place. The duke of Ragusa began his march as soon as he heard that the army of Italy was on the Isonzo. It is hoped that it will arrive at Laybach before the 5th of June.—The robber Schill, who assumed, and with reason, the title of general in the service of England, after having prostituted the name of the king of Prussia, as the satellites of England prostitute that of Ferdinand at Seville, has been pursued and chased into an island of the Elbe.—The king of Westphalia, independently of 15,000 men of his own troops, had a Dutch division and a French division; and the duke of Valmy has already united at Hanau two divisions of the corps of observation, commanded by generals Rivaud and Despeaux, and composed of the brigades Lameth, Clement, Taupin, and Vaufieldan.—The rage of the princes of the house of Lorraine against Vienna may be painted with one stroke. The capital is fed by 40 mills, raised on the left bank of the river. They have removed and destroyed them.

*Fourteenth Bulletin, dated Ebersdorf, June 1.*

The bridges upon the Danube are completely re-established: to these have been added a flying bridge; and all the necessary materials are preparing for another bridge of floats. Seven machines are employed to drive in the piles, but the Danube being in many places 24 and 26 feet in depth, much time is spent in order to fix the anchors, when the machines are displaced. However, our works are advancing, and will be finished in a short time.—The gen. of brigade of engineers, Lazowski, is employed on the left bank upon a tête-de-pont of 1,600 toises in extent, and which will be surrounded by a trench full of running water.—The 44th crew of the flotilla of Boulogne, commanded by the captain de vaisseau Baïste, is arrived. A great number of boats, cruising in the river about the islands,

protect the bridge and render great service.—The battalion of marine workmen labour in the construction of little armed vessels, which will serve completely to command the river.—After the defeat of the corps of gen. Jellachich, M. Matthieu, capt.-adjutant of the staff of the army of Italy, was sent with an orderly dragoon upon the road to Saltzburgh, who having successively met with a column of 650 troops of the line, and a column of 2,000 militia, both of whom were cut off, and had lost their way; they, on being summoned to surrender, laid down their arms.—The general of division Lauriston is arrived at Oldenburgh, the first country town of Hungary, with a strong advanced guard. There appears to be some ferment in Hungary, where men's minds are divided, the greater part of them not seeming favourable to Austria.—The general of division Lasalle has his head-quarters opposite to Besborough, and pushes his posts to Altenhough, and Rhaab.—Three divisions of the army of Italy are arrived at Neustadt. The Viceroy has been for the last two days at the head-quarters of the Emperor.—General Macdonald, who commands one of the corps of the army of Italy, has entered Gratz. There have been found in this capital of Styria immense magazines of provisions, clothing, and equipments of every kind.—The duke of Dantzic is at Lintz. The prince of Ponte Corvo is marching to Vienna. The general of division Vandamme, with the Wirtemburgers, is arrived at St. Polten, Mautern, and Crems.—Tranquillity reigns in the Tyrol; cut off by the movements of the duke of Dantzic and of the army of Italy, all the Austrians who have engaged in that point have been destroyed; some by the duke of Dantzic, others, such as the corps of Jellachich, by the army of Italy. Those who were in Swabia had no other resource than to endeavour to cross Germany as partisans, directing their march by the Upper Palatinate. They formed a small column of infantry and cavalry, which, after escaping from Lindau, was met by col. Reiset, of gen. Beaumont's corps of observation. It was cut off at Neumarek; and the whole column, officers and soldiers, laid down their arms.—Vienna is tranquil; bread and wine are in abundance; but meat, which this capital used to draw from the bottom of Hungary, begins to be scarce. Contrary to all reasons of policy and motives of humanity, the enemy do all in their power to starve

their fellow-citizens and this city, although it contains their wives and children. How different is this from the conduct of our Henry IV, who supplied a city then hostile to, and besieged by him, with provisions!—The duke of Montebello died yesterday, at five in the morning. Shortly before, the Emperor passed an hour with him. His majesty sent his aid-de-camp, Rapp, for Dr. Franc, one of the most celebrated physicians in Europe. His wounds were in good condition, but a dangerous fever had made in the course of a few hours the most fatal progress.—All the assistance of art was useless. His majesty has ordered that the body of the duke of Montebello should be embalmed, and conveyed to France, there to receive the honours that are due to his elevated rank and eminent services. Thus died one of the most distinguished soldiers that France ever produced. In the many battles in which he was engaged, he had received 13 wounds. The Emperor was deeply afflicted by this loss, which will be felt by all France.

*Fifteenth Bulletin, dated Ebersdorff, June 2.*

The army of Dalmatia has obtained the greatest success. It has defeated all that it has opposed in the battles of Mont-Kitta, Geadelchatz, Lieca, and Attachatz.—The general in chief Sloishevitch has been taken.—The duke of Ragusa arrived on the 28th of May at Fiume, and thus the army of Italy has formed a junction with the grand army, of which the army of Dalmatia forms the right. The report of the duke of Ragusa respecting these different events shall be published.—On the 28th, an English squadron, consisting of four ships of the line, two frigates, and a sloop, appeared before Triest, with an intention of taking the Russian squadron.—General count Copaulle had just arrived at that port. As the town was disarmed, the Russians landed 40 pieces of cannon, 24 of which were 36-pounders, and 16 of 24. They have placed their cannon on a battery under which the Russian squadron came to anchor with springs on their cables. Every thing was ready to receive the enemy, who seeing that he had failed in his design, went off. One thousand Austrians having passed from Krems to the right bank of the Danube, have been destroyed by the Wirtemberg troops, which took 60 of them prisoners.

*Sixteenth Bulletin, dated Ebersdorff, June 4.*

The enemy had thrown upon the right

bank of the Danube, opposite to Presburg, a body of 9000 men, who entrenched themselves in the village of Engorau. The duke of Auerstadt attacked them yesterday with the sharp-shooters of Hesse Darmstadt, supported by the 12th regiment of infantry of the line. The village was speedily carried. A major and eight other officers of Beaniieu's regiment (one of them the grand-son of field-marshal Beauhieu) and 400 privates, were made prisoners. The rest of this regiment were killed, wounded, or driven into the water. The remains of the enemy's corps found in an island the necessary protection for their re-crossing the river. The sharp-shooters of Hesse Darmstadt acquitted themselves extremely well. The Viceroy of Italy has returned to his army, and for the present has his head-quarters at Oedenburg, in Hungary.—All the valuable effects belonging to the court have been conveyed from Ofen to Peterwaradin, on the frontiers of Servia. The empress has also repaired thither. The duke of Ragusa has arrived at Laybach. General Macdonald is master of Gratz, having reduced the castle, which seemed disposed to make some resistance.—In the battle of Esling, on the 21st and 22d of last month, brigadier gen. Foulens was wounded, in making a charge, and thrown from his horse. A similar accident befel the gen. of division, Durosnel, aid-de-camp to the Emperor, as he was carrying orders to a division of cuirassiers who were charging the enemy. We have had the satisfaction of learning that both these generals, and 150 soldiers whom we gave up for lost, were only wounded, and that they were left lying among the corn at the moment when the Emperor, on learning that the bridges had been broken down, ordered the troops to concentrate themselves between Esling and Great Aspern.—The Danube falls, but from the continuance of the warm weather we fear that it will rise again.

*Seventeenth Bulletin, dated Vienna,  
June 8, 1809.*

Colonel Gorgoli, aid-de-camp of the Emperor of Russia, has arrived at the Imperial head-quarters with a letter from that sovereign for his Majesty. He has announced that the Russian army, which is marching upon Olmutz, had passed the frontiers on the 24th of May. The Emperor, the day before yesterday, reviewed his guard—infantry, cavalry, and artillery. The inhabitants of Vienna admired the

number, fine appearance, and excellent condition of these troops.—The Viceroy has gone with the army of Italy to Oedenburgh in Hungary. It appears that the archduke John intends to rally his army on the Raab.—The duke of Ragusa arrived with the army of Dalmatia, on the 3d of this month, at Laybach.—The heat is very great, and persons acquainted with the Danube assure us that in a few days it will overflow. We shall employ this time to finish driving the piles, independent of the bridges of boats and rafts.—All the accounts which we receive from the enemy state, that the towns of Presburgh, Brunn, and Znaym, are full of wounded. The Austrians themselves estimate their loss at 18,000 men.—Prince Poniatowski, with the army of the duchy of Warsaw, is pursuing the advantages he has gained. After the taking of Sandomei, he took the fortress of Zamosa, where the enemy suffered a loss of 3,000 men and 30 pieces of cannon. All the Poles who are in the Austrian army desert.—The enemy, after having failed before Thorn, have been vigorously pursued by gen. Dombrowski.—The archduke Ferdinand will derive nothing from his expedition but disgrace. He must have arrived in Austrian Silesia with his force reduced to one-third.—The senator Wibiski has distinguished himself by his patriotic sentiments and his activity.—The count de Metternich has arrived at Vienna, he is to be exchanged at the advanced posts for the French legation, to whom the Austrians, contrary to the law of nations, had refused passports, and had sent to Pest.

This Bulletin is followed by the details at length of the operations of the duke of Ragusa's army in Dalmatia; which state, that he gained a victory over the Austrians on the 16th of May, at Kitta in Croatia, in which the latter lost 400 killed, from 6 to 700 wounded, and 500 prisoners. And in another affair, on the 17th, at Gradschatz, the French are stated to have lost 300 men, and Marmont was himself wounded. Another victory is stated to have been subsequently gained by the French at Gospich, which they entered on the 23d, and arrived at Fiume on the 28th, after some skirmishes, from whence, he says, they were to march on the 31st, to unite with the army of Italy. In the whole of the actions, 6,000 Austrians and Croatians are said, in this account, to have been put *hors de combat*. The loss of the French in the affairs subsequent to the

16th, is stated at 400 killed and wounded.

*Eighteenth Bulletin, dated Vienna, June 13.*

The division of gen. Chastelar which had raised the Tyrol, proceeded on the 4th of this month to the environs of Clagenfurth, in order to throw itself into Hungary. Gen. Rusca marched against it, and a severe engagement took place, when 900 prisoners were made. Prince Eugene with a large corps manœuvres in the centre of Hungary. For some days past the Danube has risen a foot.—Gen. Graben, with a Dutch division, having marched to Stralsund, where Schill had entrenched himself, carried the entrenchments by assault. Schill gave orders to burn the town to secure his retreat, but had no time. Schill himself was killed in the great square, near the Corps de Garde, and at the moment when he fled, and was endeavouring to reach the port in order to embark.—The archduke Ferdinand evacuated Warsaw precipitately on the 2d instant, so that the whole of the Grand Duchy is abandoned by the enemy's army, whilst the troops under the command of prince Poniatowsky occupy three-fourths of Gallicia.

*AUSTRIAN ARMY.—Second Bulletin, dated Alt Oetting, April 12.*

Agreeably to the prescribed arrangements, the army advanced on the 11th further towards the Viles and the Iser.—The weather was very bad, but the troops endured all the hardships of an uncommonly severe season with the greatest cheerfulness.—On the 10th, at half past ten in the morning, field marshal De lovich entered Passau. The enemy retired, but by the rapid advance of our troops, a French officer of engineers and eight pioneers were taken. A French general in the upper fort escaped with difficulty. Prince Rosenberg, commander of the 4th corps of the army, summoned the fort to surrender, but this summons was, in compliance with the custom of war, answered by a refusal.—The true patriotic spirit of the inhabitants of Passau was clearly demonstrated by the joy they displayed on our entering the town. They immediately printed the Proclamation of his royal highness the Generalissimo to the German nation, and distributed 2,000 copies to the people of the country. Thus the feeling of German independence remains, and is cherished among them.

*Third Bulletin, dated Vils Biburg, April 15.*

The army is collected on the Vils, and will to-morrow pass the Iser at Landshut and Dingelfingen.—The enemy appears disposed to dispute the passage. The army is anxious to meet him, and to come to blows.—Field-marshal Jellachich has by this time also passed the Inn at Rosenheim and Wassenburgh, and advanced against Munich. An advanced post of the enemy has been taken at Haag; 13 prisoners and 17 horses fell into our hands. The enemy lost some killed and wounded; on our side we had only one hussar slightly wounded.—On the 9th, field-marshal Chastellar, amidst the joyful acclamations of the faithful Tyrolese, entered the Tyrol at Lienz, through the Pusterthal, and on the 12th had already reached Brauneck; the Saltzberg Jagers and some detachments of infantry, provided with snow and climbing irons, co-operate with him by the Zillerthal. Our patrols are pushed forward to Reichenhall, Lofers, and St. Johan; the militia of Lofers has occupied the pass of Strub, one of the most important entrances from Salzburg into the Junthal. The Tyrolese are every where flying to arms and expelling the Bavarians; 1,500 of the latter have taken refuge in the fortress of Kufstein, and are besieged there by the Tyrolese. A French officer had recently taken the command of that fortress; the Bavarians, however, begin to be tired of the French superiority, and feel sensibly the deep degradation of their oppressed situation. Their disgust at the arrogance of the French officers has, in several instances, produced acts of violence.

*Fourth Bulletin, dated Landshut, April 16.*

This day the army advanced to the Iser. The fifth corps was in the front, and found the bridge at Landshut broken down. A division of from 6 to 8,000 Bavarians, under gen. Deroy, defended the passage. There remained nothing to be done but to open a passage by force. The bridge was accordingly re-established under the fire of the enemy; the fifth corps crossed, and an action followed, which terminated by the retreat of the Bavarians. On both sides there were some killed and wounded, but our loss would have been still less had it been possible to restrain the ardour of the troops.—Landshut is the key of the Iser; we are in possession of a great part of Bavaria. The general of cavalry, count Bellegarde, broke up from Bohemia on the

10th, with the first corps of the army, by Tieschenreith, and on the 12th formed a junction at Werenberg with the 2d corps of the army, which had entered the Upper Palatinate by Rushaupten. Both corps took a position on the Nab, and their vanguard occupied the heights of Hirschan in order to watch the road from Bayreuth to Amberg. Here an affair of advanced posts took place with the division of Friant, which was understood to be approaching in order to reach the Danube by a rapid march through Amberg. The consequence of the action was, that this division was driven back to Neumarkt, and our advanced posts occupied Amberg. The brave Tyrolese have already killed or taken prisoners all the French and Bavarian soldiers in their territory. All the passes in the Upper Junthal, as the Zinler-berg, the Scharnitz, Leutash, Renti, &c. are occupied by the militia of the country. On the 12th, 160 men of the 11th Bavarian regiment of infantry, and 125 dragoons, with half a battery, were made prisoners at Innspruck. On the 13th, 49 French officers, 1,677 men, with 451 horses, and two light battalions of Bavarians, with two pieces of cannon, and a howitzer, surrendered at Wildau to the Tyrolese, by capitulation. To-morrow the army moves towards the Upper Danube. Hitherto we have fallen in with no French troops, though in the action of this day some French officers were taken among the Bavarians.

*Fifth Bulletin, dated Landshut, April 17.*

According to the concurring reports of all the prisoners, as well as the inhabitants at Landshut, the French general Lefevre has collected 12,000 Bavarians from the neighbourhood of Munich and Freysingen, with the view of stopping the passage of the Austrian army by Landshut. The approach to the bridges was extremely difficult. They were, besides, broken down, and the enemy's tirailleurs, who had occupied all the houses on the opposite bank, could only be driven therefrom by cannon being brought to bear upon them: each gun on our side was mounted under a shower of small shot from the enemy. In doing this, however, our artillery displayed the greatest resolution, and in two hours the whole of the opposite side of the town was in ruins.—The unfortunate inhabitants in the midst of their ruined houses bewail the melancholy fate to which this fine town has been exposed by their own countrymen. The French, who by misrepresentations,

would make appear that Austria wishes to seize Bavaria, and to disarm in a disgraceful manner the brave soldiers of that country, had required these troops to make a fruitless defence. Here French artifice succeeded in making foreign blood flow for their advantage, and in turning the arms of our German brethren against their deliverers. The first brigade was scarce formed by a few posts, when the advanced guard of the fifth corps hastened across the Iser and pursued the enemy until night. The troops are animated with an excellent spirit, and sing war songs under the thunder of the cannon. The advanced guard of field marshal Jellachich entered Munich at eleven yesterday forenoon. The king and queen have fled under French protection to Augsburg. The fourth army-corps passed the Iser without opposition at Dinga singen. The first and second corps have, after some successful fighting, advanced to Amberg, Schavendorf, and Kirn near Ratisbon. General Bellegarde cannot sufficiently praise the gallant spirit and undaunted resolution of his troops.

*Sixth Bulletin, dated Sacile, April 17.*

On the 10th and 11th his imperial highness the archduke John, with the army under his command, entered the territory of Friaule, by Pouteba, Cividale and Gortz, and after some opposition, advanced on the 13th to the Tagliamento. The enemy retired across the river, in order to join with the troops in the rear. This junction, which probably took place at Sacile, made the hostile army five divisions strong.—In the night of the 14th his imperial highness proceeded with the advanced guard towards Pordenone; the remainder of the army followed at day-break. The enemy's advanced guard was at Pordenone, and his army was posted between that place and Sacile, near Fontana. In this situation an action commenced, which, after a sanguinary contest of two days, terminated entirely to our advantage.—The vice king of Italy commanded the French army. The result was so decisive, that the enemy could not maintain themselves behind the Livenza, but were obliged to retreat rapidly to the Piave. The prisoners amount already to 6,000, among whom are generals Paza and Bressen. More are constantly brought in. The loss in killed and wounded greatly exceeds this number, and we have taken 16 cannon and three eagles.

*Letter from the Emperor Francis to Marshal Colloredo.*

DEAR FIELD-MARSHAL; Owing to the rapid movements of the army, and accumulated business, no Official Report has appeared for several days, I transmit you a concise extract of the Reports sent me, in order that you may publish them.

Scharding, April 22, 1809. FRANCIS.

*Seventh Official Report.*

After passing the Iser, his imperial highness the Generalissimo, with the 3d, 4th, and 5th corps of the army, and the 1st corps of the reserve, broke up against the Danube, in the direction to Kehlheim and Ratisbon. The enemy were drawn up near Ratisbon. Agreeable to the declaration of prisoners of war, the emperor Napoleon reached the army on the 19th instant. The Generalissimo has made a forced march from the Iser to beyond the Labar, and advanced on the 19th through Echmuhl, Rotenburgh, Cloisterrock. The enemy encountered him, and a very brisk action took place. The Generalissimo praises the bravery of the troops. Our loss is considerable: several regiments have lost all their staff, officers; field-marshal lieutenant Lusignan — the princes Louis and Maurice, of Lichtenstein, are wounded. The Generalissimo kept the army in order of battle the next day to follow the movements of the enemy. We have no further details about this affair.—The loss in killed, wounded, and prisoners, is not yet known, as the multiplicity of business prevented his imperial highness from making circumstantial reports on the field of battle (off Hansen) to his majesty. On the 26th Ratisbon capitulated.—On the same day the 5th corps of the army was also smartly attacked, near Seigenburgh, upon Abins. The archduke Lewis retreated, in common with field-marshal lieutenant Holler, against the Iser, to cover Landshut: both corps are united. On the 21st marshal Davoust attacked the 4th corps of the army, near Eckmuhl; a very severe action took place which lasted for 12 hours. On the 22d the second corps of the army retreated by Ratisbon, and combined with the main army. The head-quarters of Generalissimo the archduke Charles were on the 21st near Eglofsheim.

*Eighth Official Report.*

Tranquillizing news has been received

from the 5th and 6th corps of the army as well as the 2d. All the three corps stand united near Old Oeling. The desile near Landshut, where several waggons obstructed the road while the advancing enemy was bravely opposed, has rendered the loss of some artillery and several waggons unavoidable. By official reports, the loss of men is not considerable; only one division of the regiment of Benjaysk's infantry, which was obliged to pass the bridge of the Iser, already in flames, suffered severely. These three united corps will follow the movements of the main army, under the command of the Generalissimo. By the most recent accounts the Generalissimo's head-quarters still continued at Eglofsham, on the 22d, and the enemy in their position.—The second corps had effected a junction on the Ratisbon road with the 3d and 4th corps of reserve, and a general attack on the enemy was resolved on the 23d. On the 22d, at noon, the cannon were roaring violently in that part, and probably the murderous fight continues. The combat is conducted with uncommon animosity. Every man feels the sublime cause for which he fights. We have not yet any definitive accounts. The Emperor's court is at Schaerding. While the main army kept advancing along the Danube, and the corps near Old Oeling, stands ready either for offensive operations, or to defend the river Inn, his majesty considering the probability of a corps of the enemy threatening the frontiers of the hereditary dominions, thought it proper to order out the Militia of Lower Austria, Salzburg, and that of Inner Austria. The Militia of Upper Austria has been under arms since the armies advanced, partly on the Inn, and partly to invest the fortress of Obuhans.

N. B.—The Ninth Report is the same as has already been published from the Supplement Extraordinary to the Official Gazette of Prague.

#### *Tenth Bulletin.*

Lieutenant field-marshal Hiller has notified from St. Vert, under date of the

24th of April, that he had caused the enemy's advanced guard to be attacked on the 23d by major generals Mesko and Nordman, with the Kiermayer and Lichtenstein hussars, and the frontier corps. On the 24th the lieutenant field marshal advanced with three columns, and the enemy waited the attack before Steten, where a very obstinate action, with fortunate consequences, took place. All reports concur in stating, that the divisions of Moliter and Boudet, were both in this battle, and that the Bavarian and Hessian troops amounted together to 18,000 men. Up to the 25th, no trace of an enemy had been observed on the Austrian frontiers.

#### *Eleventh Bulletin.*

The information respecting the battle of the 22d, which has been received by his majesty, has laid the foundation for the best hopes. The result of that sanguinary contest was unexpected. In the evening, as the couriers left the field, a great superiority of cavalry decided the action unfavourably for our arms. The left wing was compelled to give way. According to a report from his imperial highness the Generalissimo, dated on the 23d, from the heights of Ratisbon, the grand army has crossed the Danube, and taken the road to Waldmunchen. Thus terminated a most obstinate battle, which had continued for five days without interruption—Fortune often fluctuated. The loss on both sides is immense. This shews that the contest was carried on both with courage and animosity.—Every one must do justice to the behaviour of our troops. The Generalissimo bestows uncommon praises on the conduct of the army, which has been quite exhausted by continued fatigue. Lieutenant field-marshal baron Hiller is between the Iser and the Inn. We have for the present changed our operations from the offensive to the defensive.

#### *Twelfth Bulletin, dated Warsaw, April 21.*

His royal highness the archduke Ferdinand, with the army under his command, crossed the Petica at Nove Miasto on the 15th, and entered the duchy of Warsaw.

2 K

#### DIRECTIONS TO THE BOOK-BINDER.

It is to be observed, that this sheet, which is the last of Volume XV., should not be cut open by the Reader, but should be left to the Book-binder, who will perceive that the first quarter, viz. p. 1025 to 1032, of which this page makes a part, comes at the end, and that the rest of the sheet, containing the Title Page and Table of Contents, is to be cut off, and placed at the beginning of the Volume.

On the 17th, our troops first met the enemy at Pietrikozoy and Konie, and immediately attacked them. On the 19th the enemy took a very advantageous position at Raszyn, and was reinforced with all the troops which were in Warsaw. But in spite of all the difficulties of the ground, the Austrians commenced the attack. The enemy made an obstinate resistance, and by the approach of night, retreated to his entrenchments in the front of Warsaw. Our loss is about 71 killed, and 255 wounded, and 72 missing. Among the dead we have to regret three brave officers; there are seven among the wounded. The imperial troops closely pursued the enemy, who entered Warsaw on the 20th. In order to spare the town the Archduke consented to enter into a negotiation with the general commanding the enemy's troops, and a treaty was concluded by which the latter has bound himself to evacuate Warsaw on the 23d, at 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

*Thirteenth Official Report, from the Imperial Royal Army.*

They write from the Court of his Majesty the Emperor, at Strengberg, under date of the 29th of April, as follows:—The engagement which field marshal Hiller gave on the 24th ult. over Neumark, took place against the French marshal Bessecres, with three French and one Bavarian division, and was very obstinate and bloody. General Hiller cannot sufficiently praise the courage and resolution of the troops. The two regiments of infantry, Klebeck and Dueck, have particularly proved what resolute foot soldiers are able to do even against cavalry. His majesty after the action presented field marshal Hiller with the cross of commander of the order of Maria Theresa. The two corps united under the command of the said field marshal, retreated towards the Inn on the 25th April, with the second corps of reserve. In consequence of the advice, that the grand army near Ratisbon had gone on the left bank of the Danube, they drew up near Old Oetling. On the 25th these corps marched by Buckhausen and Brannau to Altheim, to be ready for the defence of the Upper and Lower Inn. Field marshal lieut. Jellachich is stationed near Rosenheim and Wasserberg, and keeps up the communication with the Tyrol, as well as, by intermediate posts, that with the corps of field marshal lieut. Hiller.—On the 26th in the afternoon the enemy from Passau repulsed our weak posts on the Inn at its

entrance into the Danube: at the same time a detachment of the division of Le Grand appeared before Scharding, where the bridge had been removed, planted artillery, set fire to some houses in the town, and did not ask the replacing of the bridge before they had threatened to reduce the whole town to ashes. By the infantry stationed at Scharding, the restoration of the bridge was prevented till night by discharges of artillery and musquetry; but field marshal lieut. Dedovich, who led only a weak detachment of troops who had before that blockaded the fortress of Obuhaus, and three battalions of militia with him, having received advice of the enemy's advancing from Passau on the right bank of the Inn, he was obliged to leave Scharding and went towards Taufkirchen.—On the 27th the enemy's patroles appeared near Scharding. The enemy left the town occupied, but we have no advice of their being in great numbers on this side of the Inn. The enemy's advancing further on the road to Effenberg is not apprehended, as the corps under field marshal lieut. Hiller, is advancing down the Inn. On the 27th, the advanced guard under major general count Reduky was in Obernberg, and went down farther towards Scharding. The second corps of reserve was near Altheim, and the rest of the army near Wing, all advancing in such a manner that a battle was expected.—From the grand army intelligence has been received of the 26th April. On the 24th the army marched through Bruck and Cham, without being molested by the enemy. His imperial highness the archduke Generalissimo took an advantageous position behind the river Regen. Here the 1st and 2d corps of the army, who had not at all suffered, joined the rest. In this position his imperial highness intends to let the troops rest for some days, being tired by such long conflicts, then to counteract the enemy's movements in all directions, and avail himself of such opportunities as may offer for farther enterprize. When the reports came away, the army had been two days in the camp of Cham without any enemy's appearing. Money and ammunition has been sent to Tyrol. Field-marshal Chasteller has advanced from Innspruck to Trent, where, by certain advices, a small corps of Frenchmen and Bavarians is hemmed in. The army in Italy has crossed the Piava; and field-marshal Chasteller was making movements from Trent against Italy.

*Fourteenth Bulletin.*

The fourteenth official Report of the imperial royal army, contains advices respecting the earlier operation of the war from the 19th to the 25th of April, from the head-quarters of the archduke Charles at Katzenberg, near Cham, of the 25th April. This Report amongst other things, says—"On the 20th the archduke Charles advanced to the convent of Kohro, to prevent the junction of the marshal Davoust with the three Bavarian divisions. An engagement took place. Both parties fought with indescribable obstinacy till night, and the loss was great on both sides. Both officers and men behaved like heroes. The generals were always at the head of their troops.—Field marshal lieutenant prince of Hohenzollern and general prince Louis of Lichtenstein in person seized the colours and rushed amidst a murderous fire into the wood. Night set in, and the fourth corps maintained the field of battle, without being able to gain the heights of Abach. The enemy profited by this advantage, and effected their junction along the Danube with the Bavarian army.—In the battle on the 23d the enemy broke up with sixteen regiments of cavalry at once through Scherling into the plain of Eckmuhl. It was not till five o'clock in the afternoon the enemy's horse succeeded in breaking through and routing by their superiority of number, three of our regiments of light horse who had held out bravely. His imperial highness immediately ordered four regiments of cuirassiers to hasten to reinforce them: but the enemy followed up their advantages so suddenly and in such superior numbers, that these too were obliged to give way, and were pursued as far as Traublerg, against Ratisbon. The infantry of the 3d corps were now forced to quit their position, as the enemy had already outwinged them. The passage of the Danube, near Ratisbon, happened at broad day on the 24th, in the face of the enemy, under the protection of our artillery and cavalry, that kept off the enemy's attacks for four hours.—On our part generals prince Rohan and Schiller are wounded. We have lost some batteries, their train and horses having been shot."

*General Orders, of the 24th of May.*

The days of the 21st and 22d of May will be eternally memorable in the history of the world. The army has given proofs

of patriotism, heroism, and contempt of danger which posterity will admire, and our descendants hold up as specimens of rare and great actions. It furnished the enemy, who had lately boasted of its annihilation, with bloody proofs of its existence. It has surpassed my great expectations, and I feel proud to be its leader. You are in the field of battle the first soldiers of the world; be so also in the spirit of discipline, in the love of order, and in respect to the property of the citizen; then would you be not only the first, but the only army, and your grateful country will bless your deeds. Our beloved monarch has confidence in you, and thanks you with paternal emotions for the security of his throne, and the welfare of your families.—I expect immediately from the commanders of the different corps the most circumstantial relation of what took place with their respective divisions. The country and the sovereign wish to be acquainted with the supporters of their independence, glory, and greatness; their names shall shine in the annals of Austria; till then I can only name and reward those whose distinguished merit is either recognized by the whole army, or whom accident brought nearer to my personal observation.—Prince John of Lichtenstein, general of cavalry, has immortalized his name. This feeling, and my ardent attachment to his person, are pledges of the gratitude of our monarch. I can reward him only by the public expression of my esteem. In the name of his majesty, I nominate as commanders of the order of Theresa, baron Wimpfen, col. Smolla, &c. — The Archduke CHARLES, Generalissimo.

*Letter from his Majesty the Emperor and King, to the Archduke Charles, Generalissimo.*

" Dear brother Charles; I did, it is true, yesterday express to you in person, my warmest thanks for the glorious victory you have gained; but this is not sufficient for my heart. I say it now, and I shall repeat it on every occasion, because I, whom divine providence made the sovereign of a great monarchy, am utterly unable to reward you, my dear brother, your companions in arms, and my brave army, according to your deserts. It was reserved for you, the brother of my heart, the prime support of my throne, to interrupt, for the first time these fifteen years, the good fortune of the adversary. You are the saviour of the country, which, as well as the monarch, will eternally thank and bless you.

"With deep sensibility I yesterday observed the elevated courage and enthusiasm of the troops, and their manly resolution to assure by victory the independence of the monarchy. It was the sweetest moment of my life: a rare and heart-enlivening spectacle, and one which can never be eradicated from my mind. I beg you, dear brother, to declare this to my brave army, and to do every thing to preserve this rare spirit among them."

SPANISH REVOLUTION.—*Letter to the Vice-President of the Supreme Central Junta, dated Merida, 12th April 1809.*

EXCELLENT SIGNOR.—The greater number of the provinces of Spain have sufficiently suffered from the horrible effects of war and conquest, and the rest are threatened with the same calamities. The melancholy events of the 27th and 28th of March, afflicting the armies of generals Urbina and Cuesta, have filled with consternation and alarm those honourable Spaniards who cannot contemplate without the most poignant grief the utter desolation of our beloved country. These persons have implored the King to alleviate the distresses of such of the provinces as are occupied by French troops, and to avoid them in those which are not yet in their possession.—His majesty has attended to their prayers, and in consequence has ordered me to repair to this city, to announce his compliance to your excellency, authorising me at the same time to consult the best means of fulfilling his wishes with such Deputy or Deputies as the Supreme Central Junta shall think fit to appoint.—I cannot suppose that either your excellency or the Central Junta will refuse to take this step, on which the salvation of Andalusia and the happiness of the whole kingdom depends. The business is most important in its character, and most urgent in the present circumstances, and on that account it would be improper that it should be conducted in writing, which is

likely to occasion so many disputes, irregularities, and doubts, and which may be avoided completely by personal conference. On this ground I hope, from your honour and patriotism, and from that of the Junta, that you will name such person or persons to enter on the conference with me, with whom I will agree as to the place of interview.—God preserve you, &c. JOAQUIM MARIA SOTELO.

*Answer, addressed to General Cuesta.*

EXCELLENT SIGNOR.—On the receipt of the letter written by Don Joaquim Maria Sotelo to the Vice-President, and the insidious proposition on the part of the French government therein contained, the Supreme Central Junta has not forgotten the sacred character with which it is invested, and the solemn oaths it has taken in concurrence with the wishes of the whole Spanish nation. If Sotelo be the bearer of powers sufficiently extensive to treat for the restitution of our beloved King, and for the evacuation of our territory by the French troops instantly, let him publish them in the usual form adopted by states, and they will be announced to our allies. The Junta cannot neglect the employment of the powers conceded to it by the public will, but they have no authority to listen to any treaty, or terminate any transaction, which is not founded on the basis of eternal justice. Any other principle of negotiation, without benefiting the empire, would only tend to degrade the Junta, which has entered into the most awful engagement to bury itself beneath the ruins of the monarchy, rather than lend itself to any proposition which shall diminish the honour and independence of the Spanish people. His majesty desires that your excellency would state these sentiments to Sotelo, and by the royal order I communicate them to your excellency for your instruction and compliance. God preserve you.—(Signed)

MARTIN DE GARAY.

END OF VOL. XV.











